

III 3470  

---

De Forma Consecrationis Eucharistiæ, &c.

OR, A

DEFENCE

OF THE

*Greek* CHURCH,

AGAINST

The *Roman*, in the Article of the  
Consecration of the Eucharistical Ele-  
ments, written in *Latin*,

By the late learned Dr. I. E. GRABE;

And now first published, together with a  
Translation, for the Benefit of the *Eng-  
lish* Readers.

To which are added

Some Papers concerning the Oblation of the  
Body and Blood of Christ, the Form and Ef-  
fect of the Eucharistical Consecration, and two  
Fragments of a designed Preface to a new Edi-  
tion of K. *Edward* the VIth's first Liturgy:  
All written by the same Author.

With a Preface by the Editor, shewing the Opi-  
nion of the Church of *England* concerning the Use  
of the Fathers, and the Sense of many of her grea-  
test Members concerning the Points contended for  
by the Author of this Treatise.

LONDON: Printed for RICHARD KING, at the  
*Prince's Arms* in St. Paul's Church-Yard. MDCCXXI.

Price Two Shillings.

OR A


# DEFINITION OF THE GIVEN CHURCH

The following is the original of the  
Confession of the Church of the  
money, written in Latin.  
By the late learned Dr. A. G. R. A. R.  
and now first published together with  
a translation for the benefit of the  
English Readers.



4 48 8  
946





# THE PREFACE.



THE Author of the following Papers, was the very pious and learned Dr. Grabe. They are now deposited among the rest of his valuable Remains in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, to which, after the Deaths of Bishop Hickeſ and Biſhop Smalridge, himſelf had bequeathed them.

The Subject they treat of, is no leſs than an Eſſential of the Chriſtian Sacrifice; the Form of the Eucharistical Conſecration. This Form is here ſhewn to conſiſt, not in the Words of Inſtitution, according to the Romaniſts; but in the Uſe of thoſe Words, together with a Prayer of Bleſſing; according to the univerſal Doctrin of the Primitive Church; for this learned Perſon looked upon the earlieſt Ages, as the beſt Standard of Truth; and the Conſent of Antiquity, as the ſureſt Guide in Controverſy. This made him prefer the Greek Church to the Roman, as he declares in pag. 7 of this Treatiſe, and the Church of England to the fo-

*reign Reformers, as he informs us in a MS. mentioned by Bishop Hickeſ; for that MS. is intitled, The Excellency of the Church of England above all other Proteſtant\* Churches, &c. And this Excellency is among other Reaſons ſaid to conſiſt in her Regard to the univerſal Conſent of the Fathers, and the Catholick Tradition of the Church; and becauſe ſhe doth not tie her ſelf to Luther or Calvin's Opinions, and much leſs heretically and ſchiſmatically, denominates herſelf from any particular Name, as the Lutherans call themſelves from Luther, in plain Oppoſition to the Doctrine and Practice of St. Paul, and the Apoſtolical † Church. And indeed moſt of the Writers of the Church of England have given their Suffrage to Antiquity, and expreſſed a great Veneration for the Teſtimony of the Fathers. To mention ſome of them. Poinet, Biſhop of Wincheſter in the Reign of King Edward VI. in his Diſſallecticon, propoſes the Authority of Scripture, and the undoubted Teſtimonies of the Fathers, as the Rule by which he was to ſettle himſelf and others, in a true Notion of the Sa-*

\* Anglicanæ Eccleſiæ prærogativæ præ aliis proteſtantium cœtibus in praxi & Doctrina ſpeciatiim. Dr. Hicks's Account of Dr. Grabe. pag. vi.

† In Veneratione erga univerſalem Patrum conſenſum & Catholicam Eccleſiæ Traditionem, quoddque nec Lutheri nec Calvinii placitis ita ſtrictè adhæreat, multò minùs more Hæreticorum & Schiſmaticorum ſe à quoquam ſingulari nomine denominet, uti Lutherani ſemetipſos ita à Luthero vocant planè contra Apoſtoli Pauli, & Apoſtolicæ Eccleſiæ doctrinam atque praxim. ibid. pag. viii.

## The Preface.

V

crament of Christ's Body and \* Blood; And some pages after he says, Though we are not to place our Faith on Men but on the Word of God, yet when they confirm their Judgment by the Authority of Scripture, it is very much for the Advantage of pious Minds, and such as are desirous of Truth, to consider, how so many eminently pious and learned Men understood the Words of Scripture, and with great Agreement transmitted their Interpretations to Posterity, nor can he be excused from Rashness, that shall dare contemn so great † Authority.

*Jewell Bishop of Salisbury in the Beginning of Queen Elizabeth's Reign, had so great a Confidence in the Fathers, that he publickly declared at Paul's Cross, That if any one Authority could be produced from them within the first 500 Years after Christ, for any of the controverted Points, which he there mentioned, between the Protestants and the Romanists, he would subscribe to \* it. And to the same*

\* — Officii mei esse existimavi — quid verum sit, quid fecus, investigare; tum ex autoritate sacræ Scripturæ, & non ambiguis patrum Testimoniis, certam aliquam sententiam statuere, quâ possim & ipse mihi satisfacere, & rationem illius, si opus sit, petenti reddere. *Diallaſticon viri boni & Literati.* pag. 2. Lond. 1688.

† Quamquam fides nostra non hominibus, sed verbo Dei nititur, tamen quum illi sententiam suam autoritate Scripturæ muniant, utile est admodum piis animis & veritatis cupidis considerare, quo pacto tot eximii pietate ac doctrinâ viri Scripturæ verba intellexerint, magnoq; consensu ad posteros interpretationes suas transmiserint, neque temeritatis culpam effugiet, qui tantam audebit autoritatem contemnere. *ibid.* pag. 14.

\* Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses*. vol. 1. pag. 133.

*Pur-*



*Purpose he delivers himself in his Apology for the Church of England, when he says, We have always looked upon the Primitive Church of Christ and his Apostles, and the holy Fathers, to be Catholick, nor do we scruple to call it the Ark of Noah, the Bride of Christ, the Pillar and Ground of the Truth, or to place the Assurance of our Salvation upon † it.*

*Dr. Whitgift, Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, in the Reign of the same Queen Elizabeth, declares the Contempt of the Fathers to be a Mark of Insolence and Ignorance; for he delivers himself in these Words. Now if either godly Councils, or ancient Fathers, were any Thing at all regarded of these Men (as they be not, such is their Arrogance) this Controversy might soon be \* decided. And again. I have in sundry Points declared the Use of the Church of Christ in Times past, and do use the Testimony of ancient Councils and learned Fathers, which these unlearned Men unlearnedly contemn: A Thing not heard of in any Age or † Church, &c.*

*Adrian de Saravia, Prebendary of Canterbury, in the same Reign, declares his Preference of the Ancient Church to the Moderns in the*

† Nos Christi & Apostolorum & sanctorum Patrum primitivam Ecclesiam semper judicavimus esse Catholicam, nec eam dubitamus arcam Noë, ipsam Christi, columnam & firmamentum veritatis appellare, aut in eam omnem salutis nostræ rationem collocare. Apol. Lond. 1626. pag. 89.

\* Defence of the Answer to the Admonition. pag. 95.

† ib. pag. 881.



*most respectful Terms imaginable.* Against the unanimous and constant Agreement, *says he,* of all the Fathers of the ancient Church, nothing but the express Word of God can warrant an Innovation: For I will be bold to say, Whoever takes away all Authority from the Fathers, leaves none for \* himself. *And again.* Perhaps Beza and his Admirers may deny it: But the Fathers had a different Notion of the Matter. And far be it from me, to prefer the Judgment of Beza, or Calvin, or any other Modern, before their harmonious and agreeing Testimony, or to think that these doted, and they are † Oracles.

*In Queen Elizabeth's Time also flourish'd Bilson, the learned Bishop of Winchester, who writing against the Notion of Lay-Presbyters, expresses a great Veneration for Antiquity in the following Words.* Were the Word of God in this Point indifferent, which for ought I yet see, is very resolute against them, the general consent of all Antiquity, that never so expounded St. Paul's Words, nor ever mentioned any Lay-Presbyters to govern the

\* Contra unanimem & constantem omnium Patrum veteris Ecclesiæ consensum, nihil sine expresso Dei verbo est innovandum. Hoc enim liberè dico: Quisquis Patribus omnem auctoritatem adimit, ipse sibi nullam relinquit. Def. contr. Bede. (forsan pro Bezam) apud Bull. in Apolog. pro Harmonia. pag. 7. Edition. Oper. per Grabe. Lond. 1703.

† Fortassis negat Dominus Beza, & quotquot cum eo sentiunt: At Patres rem tamen aliter intellexerunt: quorum concordia & unanimi sententiæ absit ut Bezæ aut Calvinii aut alicujus cujuscumque ex neotericis præferam judicium, & hos sapere, illos verò desipuisse judicem. ibid.

Church,

Church, is to me a strong Rampire against all these new † Devices.

*The much admired Piece of the Church written by Field Dean of Glocester, in the Reign of King James the First, declares, That to resist against any Thing delivered ab omnibus, ubique, semper, in all Places, at all Times, by all Christian Pastors and People, not noted for Heresy, or singularity, were extream Folly and \* Madnes.*

*In the same Reign lived Overall Bishop of Norwich, in whose Convocation-Book there is a Canon, which decrees, that if any Man shall affirm — that it is not great Presumption for Men in these Days, to take upon them to know better, whether Timothy and Titus were Bishops, than the Churches and godly Fathers did, which were planted, and lived either in the Apostles Times, or presently after them, except they have some especial Revelations from God ; or, that whilst Men do labour to bring into Discredit the ancient Fathers and Primitive Churches, they do not derogate from themselves such Credit as they hunt after, and as much as in them lyeth, bring many Parts of Religion into a wonderful Uncertainty, &c. he doth greatly || err.*

† Perpetual Government of Christ's Church. Epistle to the Reader. Lond. 1610.

\* Pag. 887. Oxford. 1628.

|| Bishop Overall's Convocation-Book, 1606. Lib. 2. can. vii. Lond. 1690.

Moun-

# The Preface.

ix

*Montague Bishop of Norwich, in the Reign of K. Charles the First, among other Passages professes his Esteem for the Primitive Writers in the following Words.* Let us stand to the Judgment and Decision of Antiquity, and embrace that Saying of the Nicene Fathers, as if it came from an Oracle ; let the ancient Customs be † observed.

*His Successor, Bishop Hall, is somewhat more particular, and specifies the Ages to which he will subscribe.* Surely, says he, whosoever willingly subscribes to the Word of God, signed in the everlasting Monuments of Scripture, to the ancient Creeds, to the four General Councils, to the common Consent of the Fathers, for 600 Years after Christ, which we of the reformed Church religiously profess to do ; if he err in small Points, yet he cannot be an \* Heretick. *And again.* Neither Soul, nor Church, can generally err, whilst it treads in the Steps of the most ancient and || universal.

*In the Reign of the same King Charles the First lived Morton Bishop of Durham, who in his very learned Appeal against the Roman Church declares himself willing to submit to Primitive Testimony, though posterior to the first Century in these Words.* Notwithstanding, the

† Sententiæ & decisioni stemus antiquitatis, & cum Nicænis sanctissimis Patribus, tanquam ab oraculo protectum excollemur illud, *ἡ ἀρχαία ἰδὴ κατετέτο* Montacut. Præf. ad apparat. ad origines Eccles.

\* Noah's Dove. Vol. I. of his Works. pag. 518.

|| Ibid.



Protestants in the Disquisition of Truth, do not absolutely bound the Name of Antiquity within the Compass of the first Century of Years, but are content to allow it a longer Extent; and therefore in all Doctrines which are truly called Catholick; (that is, 1. In Respect of their Original Apostolical. 2. For their Extent universally received in all the first Churches. And 3. In their Use necessary either in Faith or in Manners) they refuse not to be tried by the Testimony of ancient Fathers in the first five hundred Years after\* Christ.

*Dr. Hammond had so great a Sense of the Authority of the Fathers, that he declared even the single Testimony of Irenæus to be a most competent Witness of the Apostolical Doctrine and † Practice. And the same Regard to Antiquity, which he professes in his own Person, he ascribes to the Church of England, when he says, Our most beloved Mother — the Church of England was particularly solicitous to preserve herself from the Rock of the Moderns, making this her distinguishing Character, and Recommendation to unprejudiced Posterity, that in determining Controversies of Faith and Practice she always maintained the Scriptures in the first Place, and then the Bishops, Martyrs, and Ecclesiastical Writers of the First Ages to be her guide and Direction, and that it was her Will the British Re-*

\* The Protestants appeal. pag. 512.

† Defence of Infant Baptism. Vol. II. of his Works. pag. 130.



# The Preface.

xi

formation should be built upon this † Foundation.

Nor is his Cotemporary Bishop Bramhall at all behind him in his Veneration for Primitive Testimony, as appears by the following Words. Thou art for Tradition, so am I. But my Tradition is not the Tradition of one Peculiar Church contradicted by the Tradition of another Church, but the universal and perpetual Tradition of the Christian World united. Such a Tradition is a full Proof, which is received semper, ubique & ab omnibus; always, every where, and by all Christians. Neither do I look upon the Opposition of an Handful of Hereticks, (they are no more, being compared to the innumerable Multitude of Christians,) in one or two Ages, as inconsistent with Universality, any more than the highest Mountains are inconsistent with the Roundness of the || Earth.

Mr. Thorndike having proved that Scripture does not clearly contain all Things necessary to Salvation, concludes thus. It remains, that we affirm, whatsoever the whole Church from the Beginning hath received and preached for the

† Certè ab hoc Novatorum seopulo sibi diligenter cautum esse voluit dilectissima mater nostra ——— Ecclesia Anglicana, hoc se universo Christianorum orbi dignoscendam, hoc æquæ posteritati æstimandam proponens, quodd in controversiis fidei, aut *opinionibus* decernendis, illud firmum ratumq; semper habuerit (& huic basi Reformationem Britannicam niti voluerit) ut Scripturis primæ, dein primorum sæculorum Episcopis, Martyribus, Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, secundæ deferrentur. Dissert. præmial. de Antichristo, &c. cap. 13. § 13.

|| Pref. to Discourse iv. of Schism guarded.

Rule of Faith and Manners, all that to be evidently true, by the same Reason for which we believe the very \* Scriptures.

*Bishop Stillingfleet declares for the ancient Fathers in the Name of the Church of England, when in answer to his Adversary's Objection, that among Protestants Scripture is left to the fanciful Interpretation of every private Spirit, he says, If he speaks of our Church, he knows the contrary, and that we profess to follow the unanimous consent of the Primitive Fathers as much as they, and embrace the Doctrine of of the four general † Councils.*

*Bishop Beveridge is very pressing in recommending the Authority of the Fathers, and tells us, that as in all Cases universal Consent is the Voice of Nature, according to Cicero, so in these Affairs, (namely, the Doctrine and Government of the Church) the Agreement of all Christians is rightly esteemed the Voice of the || Gospel. And in another Place he says, Since the universal Consent of the Church is the surest interpretation of Scripture in those Chapters; in which it can be had, it is evident what, and how great Use, the ancient Fathers and Writers of all Ages of the Church are of, and how necessary the consulting of*

\* Epilogue, Book 1. chap. 6. pag. 35.

† Discourse concerning the Idolatry practised in the Church of Rome, &c. pag. 481.

|| Quemadmodum enim omni in re consensus omnium vox naturæ est, ut ait Cicero; sic etiam in hujusmodi rebus consensus omnium Christianorum vox Evangelii meritò habeatur. Præm. ad Cod. Can. Vindicat.

them is to those who are managing Ecclesiastical Controversies, and have any Regard to their own Salvation, or the Peace of the \* Church. *And again.* Be it how it will as to other Things; whatsoever all Churches everywhere have agreed in, cannot but be most certain, and necessary to be retained by all at this † Day. *And once more.* No Body can doubt but it is most safe and highly necessary to adhere religiously to the Faith and Manners of the universal Church in all Things, as far as may || be.

*Biskop Bull, if he had not shewn his Esteem of the Fathers in his constant Appeal to them in his Writings, has done it in the most solemn Manner in the following Declaration.* God knows the Secrets of my Heart: So far am I from an Itch of innovating in theological Determinations, that whatever comes recommended by the agreeing Authority of Catholick Fathers and Ancient Bishops, though it be a-

\* Cum hæc denique universalis Ecclesiæ consensio certissima sit in iis, quibus hæbeatur, capitibus sacræ Scripturæ interpretatio, hinc clarissimè constat, quâli quantoq; usui sint antiqui Patres, aliq; omnium Ecclesiæ sæculorum Scriptores, quàmque, necessariò ab iis consulendi sint, quibus, Ecclesiasticas agitantibus controversias, vel sua salus, vel pax Ecclesiæ cordi est. *ibid.*

† Quicquid enim de alijs dicendum est, ea saltem, in quæ omnes ubique Ecclesiæ consenserunt, non possunt non certissima esse, & necessariò ab omnibus etiamnum retinenda. *ibid.*

|| Nemini enim dubium esse potest, quin universalis Ecclesiæ fidei moribusque in omnibus, quoad fieri potest, religiosè insistere, & tutissimum sit, & summè necessarium. *ibid.*



bove the Reach of my small Capacity, yet I embrace it with all \* Reverence.

*Bishop Hicke* had so great an Opinion of the Primitive Writers, that he has delivered it down to Posterity, that he that will not submit to (the) concurrent Evidence (of the ancient Liturgies, Fathers, and Councils) may bring into Controversy, not to mention other Things received by the Church in all Ages, the Divine Authority of the inspired Writings, Infant - Baptism, Episcopacy, the Lord's Day, and even the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and so at once blow up the Catholick Faith and † Church.

*Mr. Wall* not only shews himself to be an Admirer of Antiquity, but observes, That there is no Man, that does really slight (it,) though those that have no Skill in it, or do suspect that it will go against their Side, will make as if they did. And therefore, says he, you will see both on the one Side and on the other, those Men, who for a Flourish, do pretend that they lay small Stress on it, as having Proof enough from Scripture, yet take all the Pains possible to bring this Argument to bear on their Side; and that so zealously, that they often do it unfairly. There is no Christian that loves to hear,

† Deus novit cordis mei secreta : In dogmatis ( *forſan pro dogmatibus* ) Theologicis, a novaturiendi prurigine — a deo alienus ſum, ut quæcunque Catholicorum Patrum, & veterum Episcoporum conſenſu comprobata ſunt, etiamſi meum ingenium ea non aſſequatur, tamen omni reverentiâ amplexurus ſim. *Apol. pro Harmoniâ, &c.* p. 7. Ed. Oper. per Grabe, Lond. 1703.

† Christian Priesthood. Vol. i. pag. 145.



## The Preface.

xv

or to admit, that all the ancient Churches preached otherwise than he does in a controverted \* Matter.

*Mr. Reeves affirms, that the safest Method to understand the Holy Scripture, is the general Sense of the Catholick Writers in the purest Ages of the † Church. And in another Place he delivers himself thus.* Those who admit the Canon of Scripture, upon the Testimony of the Fathers, will find themselves hard put to it for a Reason, why they reject the very same Testimony in the Case of \* Church-Government. *And again.*— Upon the Whole, I think, I may with Reason affirm the Primitive Christians to be not only the most faithful Guardians of the Canon, but of the Sense of Scripture also; and therefore when I see some Men playing their whole Artillery against them, and running riot upon the absolute Perfection of Scripture, the better to run down the Use of the Fathers, and by getting them out of the Way, to fall foul upon the unguarded Letter, and murder it to their own Purpose, it puts me in Mind of the like Practices upon their Sovereign, as upon the Scripture: For just such hollow Panegyricks came whistling from the same Quarter, that a good King would reign most gloriously without his Guards, alone secure in

\* Pref. to History of Infant-Baptism. vol. 1. pag. 6.

† Preface concerning the right Use of the Fathers, before his Apologies. vol. 1. pag. 6.

‡ ib. pag. 16.

the Hearts and Affections of his People, and when they had importuned him out of his Forces, how they decided his Person, I need not \* tell.

*Bishop Potter gives us his Opinion in the following Words.* I have always thought it the best Method of discovering the genuine Sense of the Scriptures, to compare them with the Practice of the First Christians, who had far better Opportunity of acquainting themselves with the Judgment of the Apostles, than we can pretend to at this Distance; and cannot generally be supposed in those Times of Danger and Persecution, when there was no Motive to profess Christianity, but the preserving of a good Conscience, to have wilfully corrupted or deviated in any Respect from the Divine † Oracles. *And in another Place he says, —* Few there are, or rather none at all, as far as I have been able to observe, who refuse to allow the Testimony of the Primitive Writers, its due Weight and Authority, such only excepted as have not read them, or are afraid of their Evidence; and therefore to divert us from the true Sense of the holy Scriptures, in discovering which, those Interpreters have commonly the best Success; who most carefully compare them with other Books of the same, or the next Ages, as the best Criticks always do in explaining other Authors, would strictly con-

\* *ib.* pag. 26.

† Pref. to Discourse of Church-Government.

fine us to the mere Words, because these alone, and unsupported, may more easily be forced to countenance their || Innovations.

The learned Mr. Johnson has not only shewn his Respect to the Fathers in the whole Tenor of his Writings, but has particularly contended for the Use and Necessity of them, as in other Passages, so in the following Words. I conceive that Man ought to suspect his own Judgment and Orthodoxy, whose Opinions sink below the Standard of the second Age after \* Christ. And again, I am very sure, says he, speaking of the Bread and Wine being the true Body and Blood of Christ, it had been very happy, if the great Leaders of the Reformation had been pleased to take such Light, as Antiquity would plentifully have given them in this Particular: and would have leaned less to their own Judgments, and more to the Sentiments of the Primitive Church, in interpreting the Texts relating to this † Subject.

There is, says Dr. Marshall, I trust, even still a Remnant left of Persons who will be glad to know the Sense of the Church in her earliest and purest Ages, ( whilst Miracles were yet vouchsafed to her ) concerning the great Deposita committed to her Care and † Custody. And that by the earliest and purest Ages, he does not confine himself to the Writings of St.

|| Charge to the Clergy, &c. pag. 19. Lond. 1720.

\* Unbloody Sacrifice. vol. 1. pag. 212.

† ibid. pag. 219.

† Pref. to Translation of S. Cyprian. pag. 3.



*Clement, Hermas, and Ignatius, is plain from the Scope of his Preface, which is to recommend a Father of the third Century, St. Cyprian; as also from another Passage, in which he gives a Reason why these Fathers are not equally full and copious with those that succeeded them. They, says he, who took up the Work where the Apostles left it, had so much Business upon their Hands and led such unsettled, ambulatory Lives, that we are not to wonder, if the Monuments we have from them be concise and few, and give us but Imperfect Notions of their Belief and \* Practice. He proceeds to observe that, The Sense of Scripture is better opened by the Practice which followed immediately upon their Publication, than by any modern Comments, which too often speak their Author's Prejudices, and convey to the Reader no other Notion than of his Scheme or System. The Fathers, continues he, of the first Centuries might insist very properly upon the Advantage of their Traditions, which flowed at that Time down to them in a pure and easy Channel, where any foreign Mixture would have been presently discerned, and an appeal would immediately have been lodged against it in the Apostolical \* Churches. And again. Religious and physiological Inquiries are thus far parallel, that they have come nearest to the Truth in both of them, who have least departed from Tradi-*

\* *ibid.* pag. 4.



tion, to follow their own uncertain \* Speculations. *And once more,* It is the Glory of our English Church, and what she often boasts of, that she is the nearest of any now in the Christian World to the Primitive Model. It is not, I presume, denied that she might be nearer still; and if her Glory be great for being so near, it would certainly be greater if she yet were † nearer.

*Dr. Bisse thinks it one great Argument for the Dignity of the Clergy, that they are Successors to the Fathers, the Use of whose Writings he admirably describes in the following Paragraph.* This one Thing the Time allows, and the Times oblige me to mention as a Glory inherent in the Character of the Fathers; that as they were appointed by God to be the Ambassadors, so were they acknowledged by Men to be the best Interpreters of the Word of God, that Law of the most High; even as the Judges in our Israel, which, though not the Authors, are referred to, as the Interpreters of our Law. And as the Reports and Decrees of ancient Judges, which rest in their Graves, are the Rule of the present that sit on our Tribunals; as these stand and ask for the old Paths, which is the good Way, determining it to be the good, because old: so the ancient Writings and Interpretations of the Fathers, the Authority of each

\* *ibid.* pag. 6.

† *ibid.* pag. 12.

taking Place with their Antiquity, have been, are, ought, and must be, the Rule of Judging in all succeeding Ages of the Church. Such is the Authority of the ancient Fathers, next in Degree, as in Time, to that of the Apostles; the Fathers as Interpreters, the Apostles as Editors of the holy Gospel; both called to be preachers of it, both our Ancestors in the Christian Priesthood. And those that are Sons, who believe the Inspiration of the one, generally submit to the Interpretations of the \* other.

*Dr. Waterland gives us his Suffrage in these Words.* What we pretend is, that we have as good Proof of the Doctrine of the Church, as of the Canon of Scripture. Whether the Church, after the Apostles, was as infallible as the Apostles themselves, is quite another Question? We think it very unlikely, that the Apostolick Churches should not know the Minds of the Apostles, or should suddenly vary from it, in any Matter of Moment. We look upon it as highly improbable, that the Faith of those Churches should run counter to any Thing in Scripture, since they had the best Opportunities of knowing what Scripture meant, were made up of wise and good Men, Men who would sooner die than commit any Error in that Kind wilfully. Upon this, we believe the concurring Judgment of Antiquity to be, though not infallible, yet

\* Dr. Bisse's Sermon preached before the Sons of the Clergy. Lond. 1717. pag. 11, 12.

the safest Comment upon Scripture, and to have much more Weight in it, than there generally is in Wit and Criticism; and therefore not to be rejected, where the Words of Scripture will with any Propriety bear that \* Interpretation. *Nay he thinks it extremely probable, that the Scriptures cannot be for us, where the Fathers are against us; for he thus bespeaks the Person he is writing against; As you certainly want one, (Namely the Fathers) so it is extremely probable, that you have neither, for this very Reason, among many others, because you have not both. This Argument is of Force and Weight, and will hardly yield to any Thing short of || Demonstration. And in another Place he affirms, that if what appears but probably to be taught in Scripture it self, appears certainly to have been taught by the Primitive and Catholic Church; such probability so confirm'd and strengthened carries with it the Force of † Demonstration.*

*Dr. Knight speaking of the ancient Fathers assembled in the Council of Nice, says, To these it becomes us to make our Appeal, in Controversies relating to the Nature and Person of the Son of God, as able Witnesses of the Mind of Scripture, and the common Traditions and Doctrines of the \* Church.*

\* Vindication of Christ's Divinity. pag. 458.

|| *ibid.* pag. 459.

† Preface to his 8 Sermons, &c. pag. 4.

\* Visitation Sermon preached at S. Sepulchre's, Nov. 10.



From particular Testimonies we pass to the Declaration of the whole Church. In the Year 1571, the Convocation gave this Direction to the whole Clergy. First, Let them take Care, that they never teach any Thing in a Sermon, which they would have the People hold and believe, but what is agreeable to the Doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and which the Catholick Fathers and ancient Bishops have collected from that very \* Doctrine.

And as the Fathers are for all Points of Doctrine recommended by the Convocation, so are they particularly referred to for the Doctrine of the Eucharist by the Homilies; for say they, — Before all other Things, this we must be sure of, especially that this Supper be in such Wise done and administred, as our Lord and Saviour did, and commanded to be done, as his holy Apostles used it, and the good Fathers in the Primitive Church frequented † it.

As to the ancient Liturgies quoted in the following Piece, I think it cannot reasonably be doubted but they ought to have a Share in primitive Testimony. S. Basil and S. Chrysostom's Liturgies are quoted by the Homilies as Proofs that in their Times, the publick Prayers were offered up in a known † Tongue. Bishop Hicke declares, that whatever the Liturgies have in common with (the Apostolick Constitutions)

\* Sparr. Collect. pag. 237.

† Second Part of the Sermon concerning the Sacrament. Lond. 1683. pag. 270.

† Of Common Crayer and Sacraments. pag. 216.

# The Preface. xxiii

and with one another must be Primitive and || pure. *And Bishop Bull says, It is observable, that however those ancient Liturgies have been altered and corrupted in after Times by many Additions and Interpolations; yet there are in all of them still remaining many excellent and Divine Forms of Prayer and Thanksgiving, wherein they do all perfectly agree, and which therefore cannot reasonably be thought to have any other Original than Apostolical Order and Appointment, delivered to the several Nations and People, together with the first preaching and Plantation of Christianity among \* them.*

*Having thus shewn, that the Church of England pays a great Regard to the Primitive Church, I shall in the next Place make it appear, that the Opinion that the Eucharistical Symbols are not consecrated without a Prayer of Blessing (which in the following Sheets is proved to be the Doctrine of the primitive Church) is also agreeable to the Principles and Declarations of many famous Writers of the English Church.*

*Morton, Bishop of Durham, whom I mentioned before, speaks full to this Purpose, when he says, The first Transgression of the (now) Church of Rome, in contradicting Christ his Canon, is collected out of these Words, and he blessed it, which concern the Consecration*

|| Christian Priesthood. vol. 1. pag. 145.

\* Sermons. vol. 2. pag. 549.

of this Sacrament. First of the Bread, the Text saith; he blessed it: Next of the Cup, it is said, when he had given Thanks, which Words in your own Judgments, are all one, as if it should be said, he blessed it with giving Thanks. By the which Word Blessing, he doth imply a Consecration of this \* Sacrament. *And again speaking of the Words,* This is my Body, *he says,* These Words therefore are of Declaration, and not of † Invocation. *And once more, speaking of the same Words,* Although they be not Words of Blessing and Consecration, (because not of Petition but of Repetition) yet are they Words of ‖ Direction.

*The learned Mr. Thorndike is no less clear upon the Subject before us; For says he,* If the Eucharist be not consecrated by that Means, by which the Church, from the Beginning, hath always consecrated the Eucharist, then it is not celebrated in the Unity of God's Church. Now I conceive, I have shewed, that the Church from the Beginning did not pretend to consecrate by these bare Words, This is my Body, This is my Blood, as operator in changing the Elements into the Body and Blood of Christ, but by that Word of God, whereby he hath declared the Institution of this Sacrament, and commanded the Use of

\* Discourse of the Institution of the Sacrament, &c. pag.  
9. § 3.  
† *ibid.*  
‖ *ibid.*



## The Preface.

xxv

it; and by the Execution of this Command. Now it is executed, and hath always been executed by the Act of the Church, upon God's Word of Institution, praying, that the Holy Ghost, coming down upon the present Elements, may make them the Body and Blood of \* Christ.

*Hamon L'Estrange, in his excellent Annotations on the Common-Prayer, speaking of the Words of Institution, This is my Body, &c. delivers his Opinion of this Matter in the following Paragraph; — That a bare Narrative can be qualified to consecrate, is certainly new Divinity, unknown to Scripture, and Antiquity interpreting it. Therefore I must adhere in Judgment to those learned Men, who derive Consecration from the Word of God and † Prayer. — And again. The Words of Invocation of God's Blessing jointly with those of Christ's Institution, constitute the || Consecration. — And once more. If the Blessing of the Symbols be, as it is, an Essential Part of Consecration, then Reason good, that with the words whereby it is accommodated and applied, the Ceremony proper to it, that I mean of imposing of Hands, should be used \* also.*

\* Just Weights and Measures. pag. 94.

† Alliance of Divine Offices. pag. 205. 1699.

|| *ibid.* pag. 207.

\* *ibid.*

Dr. Creighton, *Bishop of Bath and Wells*, in the Reign of King Charles the Second, seems also on this Side of the Question, when he tells us that the Force of Consecration does not depend upon the Words of our Lord, pronounced by any Person, otherwise a Shepherd might be a Priest; bnt upon the Priest alone pronouncing the Words of our Lord, together with Prayer and \* Supplication.

*Bishop Hicke*s not only produces the Testimony of the Ancients for this Opinion, but also agrees with Dr. Grabe in thinking it founded upon Scripture. From all that I have said, says he, or cited out of the solemn Prayers, which were made to God in the Administration of the Eucharist, to send down his Holy Spirit upon the Priest, the Sacrifice and the People, and from his mighty, most special Assistance, and chief Ministration in the holy Action, particularly in the sanctifying the Oblations; I say, I cannot from considering all this, but think it very probable, that the Apostle alluded to the common Notion the Christians had of the Eucharistical Oblations being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, in saying, that the Oblation he made of the Gentiles was acceptable to God, being [like the Eucharistical Bread and Wine] sanctified by the Holy † Ghost.

\* Non à verbis Dominicis cujuscunque ore prolatis vis consecrandi pendet, aliter pastores ovium possent esse pastores animarum, sed à sacerdote solo, verba Dominica cum Oratione supplice & votis pronuntiante. Notæ in Histor. Concil. Florentin, pag. 37. Hagæ Comit. 1660.

† Christian Priesthood. vol. 1. pag. 97.

Mr. Johnson, as he has given a very ample Account of the primitive Doctrine of the Eucharist, so is he by no Means defective in this Part of it. The holy Fathers, says he, had a just Sense of the Dignity of the Christian Mysteries, and the very Center, in which all their Reasonings and Arguments on this Subject meet, is this, That the Holy Ghost at the Prayers of the Priest and People is in a particular Manner present, and imparts a secret Power to the Sacramental Body and Blood, by which they are made to be in Energy and Effect, though not in Substance, the very Body and Blood, which they || represent. *And again.* The Invocation of the Holy Ghost on the Symbols, was certainly thought necessary by the Primitive Church; and if this were necessary in the Primitive Ages, it cannot be unnecessary \* now. *And once more.* I wish that I could say, that the Reformation had reduced our Liturgy to the Primitive State in this † Particular.

The Contents of the eleventh Section of the 3d Chapter of Book XV. of Mr. Bingham's *Antiquities* are another Evidence for this Doctrine. *They run thus.* The Form of Consecration always composed of a Repetition of the Words of Institution, and Prayer to God to sanctify the Gifts by his Holy Spirit.

|| Unbloody Sacrifice. v. 1. pag. 179.

\* ib. v. 2. pag. 179.

† ib. pag. 180.



The next *Writer* I shall mention upon this Head, is the learned Mr. *Wheatly*, who in his *Illustration of the Book of Common-Prayer*, gives us his *Sentiments* of this Matter in the following Words. Our Saviour himself did not deliver this Bread and Wine, until he had consecrated them by blessing them, and giving Thanks; so that this Prayer is the most ancient and essential Part of the whole Communion \* Office. And again. Though all Churches in the World have through all Ages used the Words of Institution at the Time of Consecration, yet none that I know of, except the Church of Rome, ever before attributed the Consecration to the bare pronouncing of those Words only: But the Change of the Elements into the Body and Blood of Christ, was always attributed by the most ancient Fathers to the Prayer of the † Church.

As to the Practice, we have a Petition for the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Elements, both in the first English reformed Liturgy, and also in the Scots Common-Prayer Book, composed almost 90 Years after. In the former it runs thus. Hear us (O merciful Father) we beseeche thee, and with thy Holy Spirite and Worde vouchsafe to bl<sup>+</sup>esse and sanc<sup>+</sup>tifie these thy Gyfts and Creatures of Breade and Wyne, that they may be unto us the Bodye

\* pag. 289. Lond. 1720.

† ibid. pag. 290.

## The Preface.

xxix

and Bloud of thy moſte derely beloved Sonne Jeſus Chriſte. *In the other it is expreſſed as follows.* Heare us, O merciful Father, we moſt humbly beſeech thee, and of thy Almighty Goodneſſe vouchſafe ſo to bleſſe and ſanctifie with thy Word and Holy Spirit, theſe thy Gifts and Creatures of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy moſt dearly beloved Sonne: *Agreedably to which, Biſhop Taylor in his Collection of Offices, printed at London in the Year 1658 gives this Direction.* Then ſhall follow this Prayer of Conſecration, to be ſaid by the Miniſter ſtanding. Have mercy upon us, O heavenly Father, according to thy glorious Mercies and Promiſes, ſend thy Holy Ghoſt upon our Hearts, and let him alſo deſcend upon theſe Gifts, that by his good, his holy, his glorious Preſence, he may ſanctify and enlighten our Hearts, and he may bleſs and ſanctify theſe \* Gifts.

*Thus the Reader may ſee, that our learned Author was neither ſingular in the Method nor Subject of his Proof. He has, indeed, gone ſomewhat farther than moſt of the Writers I have quoted, in aſſerting, that the Form of Conſecration, which both they and he contend for, is deſective in the Church of England; but then he gives ſuch Reaſons for his Aſſertion, as will not, I believe, be eaſily overthrown.*

*It may alſo be obſerved, that in the Appendix to the following Papers we find Bread, Wine,*

\* Office for the holy Communion.

and

*and Water, called the Matter of the Sacrament. But this is agreeable to our Author's publick Declarations in his printed Writings: For in his Note upon Chap. 2. Book V. of Irenæus, speaking of the Use of the Mixture, both among the Catholicks and Hereticks, he says, They did this in Imitation of our Saviour himself, who at his Holy Supper affirmed the Mixture of the Cup to be his Blood, as Irenæus says, p. 357. col. 2. lin. 1. and promised to drink the Mixture new with his Disciples in his Kingdom, as the same Irenæus writes, pag. 461, col. 2. lin. 28. seq. Nor can any one doubt of it, who considers, that this Custom was was of such Esteem among the Jews, that they did not think the Passover was rightly celebrated in unmixed Wine, as the Author of an admirable, though an anonymous, English Treatise concerning Lent, whom I cannot but here name with Honour, George Hooper, Dean of Canterbury, has proved from Maimonides concerning the Paschal Solemnity. cap. 7. §. 9. Now this constant Practice and Doctrine of the Jews before Christ, and the Christians after him, both shews it to have been used by Christ himself, and enjoined upon all \* others. Then having produced*  
*S. Cy-*

\* Fecerunt id exemplo ipsius Servatoris nostri, qui in prima S. Cæna temperamentum Calicis suum sanguinem confirmavit, ut Irenæus supra. pag. 357. col. 2. lin. 1. scribit, & mixturem calicis novam in regno cum discipulis habiturum se pollicitus est, prout inferius. pag. 461. col. 2. lin. 28. seq. loquitur: neque hac de re dubitabit, qui istum ritum inter Judæos



S. Cyprian's Reasons and Authority, he concludes with offering them to the Consideration of those Persons, who on the contrary offer Wine alone without Water upon the sacred || Table.

*This Practice of the Eucharistical Mixture, though it is not thought necessary by the Church of England, is yet so far from being condemned by her, that some of her greatest Men have made Use of it, and others have expressed themselves desirous of having it restored; nay, it was expressly enjoined in the first English Liturgy after the Reformation; a Liturgy declared by the whole Legislative Authority of the Kingdom to be concluded by the Aid of the Holy Ghost (a), to be a very godly Order, agreeable to the Word of God, and the Primitive Church, very comfortable to all Good People designing to live in Christian Conversation, and most profitable to the State of this (b) Realm,*

dæos adeo receptum fuisse consideraverit, ut paschale epulum haud ritè mero vino sine aquâ se celebrare putaverint, sicut ex Maimonide de solennitate Paschali, cap. 7. § 9. probavit auctor egregiè planè licet anonymi tractatus Anglicè Scripti de Jejunio quadragesimali honoris causâ à me nominandus, D. Georgius Hooperus Decanus Cantuariensis. Atqui hæc Judæorum ante Christum, & Christianorum post eum continua praxis ac Doctrina, sicut idem ab ipso Christo factum indicat; ita & omnibus faciendum injungit. lib. v. cap. 2. pag. 397.

|| — Quæ idcirco profero, ut ea considerent, qui contra in Eucharistico calice solum vinum sine aquâ sacræ mensæ apponunt. *ibid.*

(a) 2, 3 Edward VI. cap. 1. Collier's Eccles. History; vol 2. pag. 263.

(b) 5, 6 Edward VI. cap. 1. *ib.* pag. 320.

*compiled by certain of the most learned and discreet Bishops, and other learned Men of this Realm (c), and affirm'd by ArchBishop Bancroft to have been published first with such Approbation, as that it was accounted the Work of (d) God. This Liturgy, I say, enjoins the Mixture in the following Words, Then shall the Minister take so much Bread and Wine, as shall suffice for the Persons appointed to receive the holy Communion, laying the Bread upon the Corporal, or else in the Paten, or in some other comely Thing, prepared for that Purpose; and putting the Wine into the Chalice, or else some fair and convenient Cup, prepared for that Use, (if the Chalice will not serve) putting thereto a little pure and clean (e) Water. Thus far the Liturgy.*

*Now as to Particular Persons:*

(c) 2, Edward VI. *Primitive Rule of Reformation according to the first Liturgy of K. Edward the VIth, 1549. pag. 14.*

Their Names are, Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Goodrick, Bishop of Ely, Holbeck, Bishop of Lincoln, Day, Bishop of Chichester, Skip, Bishop of Hereford, Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster, Ridley Bishop of Rochester, Dr. Cox, K. Edward's Almoner, and Dean of Christ's-Church, Dr. May, Dean of S. Paul's, Dr. Taylor, or Tyler, Dean of Lincoln, Dr. Heynes, Dean of Exeter, Dr. Robinson, or Robertson, Arch Deacon of Leicester, afterwards Dean of Durham, Dr. Redmayne, Dean of Westminster, and Master of Trinity College in Cambridge, *vid. Sparrows Rationale & Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. 2. pag. 243.*

(d) *vid. Primitive Rule of Reformation, &c. pag. 15.*

(e) Rubrick after the Offertory.

*Bishop*

*Bishop Andrews, who lived long after the Alteration of the first Common-Prayer, being Bishop of Winchester, in King Charles the first's Time, does in two Rubricks direct the Mixture to be used in the Form of Consecration of a Church or Chappel, composed by him. The first is after the Offertory in these Words. Then the Bishop returns to the Holy Table ( both the Chaplains withdrawing a little ) and washing his Hands, breaking the Bread, pouring the Wine into the Cup, and mixing it with Water, he stands and ( a ) says. The other is as follows. When the Wine before poured out, is not sufficient, the Bishop pours more into the Chalice out of the Cup that stood upon the holy Table; and mixing it with Water he recites distinctly the Words of ( a ) Consecration. And here we may observe, that this Practice continued in the King's Chappel Royal, all the Time this Prelate was Dean of ( b ) it.*

*Hamon L'Estrange affirms the Mixture to have been the ancient Practice, and to have been used partly in Imitation of our Saviour's Act in the first Institution of the Eucharist, agreeable to the Custom of that hot Climate, which*

( a ) *Cæteris rebus ordine gestis, demum Episcopus ad sacram mensam redit ( Sacellanis utrisq; aliquantulum recedentibus ) lotisq; manibus, pane fracto, vino in Calicem effuso, & aquâ admistâ, stans ait.*

*Cum vinum, quod prius effuderat, non sufficeret, Episcopus de novo in Calicem ex poculo, quod in sacrâ mensâ stabat, effeundit, admistâq; aquâ, recitat clarè verba illa consecratoria. See the Form at the End of Sparrow's Rationale. pag. 42, 43.*

( b ) *Primitive Rule of Reformation, &c. pag. 20.*



constantly used to allay the Heat of the Wine with Water, and partly, because that when our Saviour's Side was pierced with the Lance, there issued out both Water and (c) Blood.

*Mr. Sellar in his Remarks* relating to the State of the Church of the first Centuries, *has these Words.* The mixing Water with Wine in the Eucharist, was a Custom common in the Days of Justin Martyr and Irenæus, both in the East and West, and of S. Cyprian in the South, who at large pleads for it, as what he was enjoined to use by a miraculous Notice from Heaven; it being not improbable, that our Saviour according to the Custom of those Eastern Countries did dilute the rich and brisk Wines which he drank, as a Testimony of Sobriety. For that our great Master did so celebrate, is expressly mentioned in the Liturgies of S. James, S. Mark, S. Basil, and S. Chrysostom; and according to this Pattern did the ancient Councils enjoin all holy Priests to officiate those Mysteries; and Gennadius numbers it among the Catholick Practices of the Age that he lived in; nor was the Church without good Reason, besides the Example of the Son of (d) God. *And in another Place he observes, that* in the Order for the Communion under K. Edward the sixth, the Priest is required to bless and Consecrate the biggest Chalice, or some fair and convenient Cup, or

(c) Alliance of Divine Offices. pag. 203. Edit. 1699.

(d) pag. 344.

## The Preface.

xxxv

Cups full of Wine with some Water put to it, which Custom, says he, was afterwards, I know not for what Reason, (e) altered.

*Bishop Hooper is plainly of Opinion, that our Saviour's Cup was mixed; for he says, it was the third Cup at the Jewish Passover. The Cup after Supper, the Cup of Blessing, as it is called by S. Paul in express Terms, (a) what should it be, but what the Jews call by that Name, and with which they thank for the Meal, the third (b) Cup? And in the Passage I shall cite from him he says, that the four Paschal Cups were mingled with Water: But if these four Cups were mixed, and our Saviour's Cup was the third of those four, then our Saviour's Cup was mixed also. In the Chapter, from whence I take that Passage, the learned Author is endeavouring to shew the Correspondency of the Lord's Supper to the Jewish Offering of Praise and Thanks, and mentions the Mixture as one Particular of it. — The Mixture of Water, says he, with the Sacramental Wine, of which the Ancients Speak, was done too after the Manner of the Jews; and in their Opinion, did not make it less proper for a Cup of Thanksgiving: For they likewise do not think (c) they celebrate their Paschal Supper duly with pure Wine, but mix it*

(e) Remarques, &c. pag. 347.

(a) 1 Cor. 10. 16.

(b) Discourse concerning Lent. Lond. 1696. chap. 3. p. 2. § 2. pag. 173.

(c) Maim. de solemn. Pasch. c. 7. § 9.

with Water; that they may the more freely drink the four Cups, and also for the better Taste, and their greater (d) Pleasure.

*Bishop Hicke's great Regard for the Practice of the Mixture, is known to most of those, who had the Honour of his Acquaintance, and may appear to others from Dr. Grabe's Note upon Irenæus, before cited: For to that Note he refers his Reader in his Christian Priesthood. Vol I. p. 103. Note c.*

*Bishop Potter testifies, that the ancient Church mixed the Eucharistical Wine with Water, and quotes Irenæus as declaring the same to have been our Saviour's (e) Practice.*

*Mr. Bingham is so far from thinking, that the Primitive Christians used the Mixture as an indifferent Rite, that he declares, they believed it our Saviour's Institution. As to the Ancients, says he, they are not to be blamed in keeping strictly to this Custom, because they thought it a Part of the Institution. Upon which Account they censured all that made any Alteration in the Elements, either by Addition or Subtraction, or changing one Element for another. The Aquarians——were condemned, for taking away the Wine; the Armenians, and others, for not using Water (a) also.*

(d) Discourse concerning Lent. part 2. chap. 7. § 4. pag. 287.

(e) Clemens Alex. vol. 1. pag. 177.

(a) Antiquities of the Christian Church. Book xv. chap. 2. § 8. vol. 6. pag. 619, 620.



## The Preface.

xxxvii

Mr. Johnson expresses his Desire that the Mixture was restored, and affirms, there is good Reason to believe, that our Saviour and his Apostles tempered their Wine with (b) Water.

Mr. Wheatly speaking of the Injunction of the Mixture in the first reformed Liturgy, says, This was ordered in Conformity to a very ancient and Primitive Practice, and with an Eye, perhaps, to our Saviour's (c) Institution.

Nay, some of those Writers, who seem the least fond of the Mixture, have made large Concessions in Favour of it. Thus Bishop Jewel acknowledges that S. Cyprian and other Fathers laid much Stress upon (d) it. Bishop Whitgift, that the same S. Cyprian, and others of the Ancients believed it to be (e) necessary; and Mr. Cartwright, that it appears both from Justin Martyr and Cyprian, that a necessary and great Mystery was placed in (f) it. And it is remarkable, that of the five modern Testimonies produced in the Desertion discussed against the necessity of the Mixture, one of them expressly owns, that many of the Ancients conceited, (as it speaks) that Christ at his last Supper, mingled Water with (a) Wine; two of them suppose

(b) Unbloody Sacrifice. vol. 2. pag. 174, 175.

(c) Illustration of the Common-Prayer. pag. 277. London 1720.

(d) Vid. Romish Apology in Bishop Morton's Protestant Appeal, &c. lib. 2. cap. 4. § 11. pag. 138.

(e) ib.

(f) ib.

(a) viz. Dr. Featley. Desertion discussed. Edit. 2. pag. 99.

it probable, that this was our Saviour's (b) Practice; and the other two acknowledge it to have been the General Usage of the ancient (c) Church.

In two of the Testimonies above cited, our Saviour is said to have used the Mixture in Conformity to the Custom of allaying the Heat of the Wine with Water in those warm Climates, and others of them might be produced for the same Opinion. Indeed, this has been the general Way of accounting for the lawfulness of laying it aside. But Dr. Grabe seems to have rejected it as an Argument of no Weight, for he calls Bread, Wine, and Water, the Matter of the Sacrament, and expressly declares, that the Use of the Mixture was enjoined upon all Christians; nor has he rejected it without Reason. It is an Argument that proves too much, and therefore proves nothing; for if our Saviour used the Water upon the Account of Custom, he used the Bread and Wine upon the same Account; for he created no new Species for the Sacramental Elements, but took the common Food and Drink of the Country, and consecrated them into his Body and Blood; and yet it is not thought lawful to consecrate Ale, though it be the common Drink of these Parts. As then the Wine cannot be laid aside, though it was the common Drink of the Country, where our Saviour instituted the

(b) Dr. Taylor, and Dr. Horneck. *ibid.* pag. 100, 102.

(c) Dr. Cave and Dr. Field. *ibid.* pag. 101, 102.

Eucharist, so neither can the Mixture; for where there is the same Reason, there must be the same Acknowledgment: Besides, though our Saviour might use Bread, Wine, and water, because they were the customary Food of the Country, yet when he had used and instituted them, they became a Sacrament, and were to be administered, not according to the Custom of Countries, but the Example of Christ; and therefore the ancient Church never gave the Custom of the Country as a Reason for their mixing Water with the Sacramental Wine; and, which is more, we find the Mixture used, where that Reason ceased, in cold Climates, where there was no Occasion to allay the Heat of the Wine with Water, particularly in our own, as appears from the famous Saxon Homily translated by Ælfrick Abbot of Malmsbury, eight hundred and fifty Years since, in which are these Words; Holy Books command, that Water be mingled with Wine, which shall be for Housel, because the Water signifieth the People, and the Wine Christ's (a) Blood, &c.

As to the Doctrine of the Eucharistical Oblation, which is also Part of this Appendix, the Reader may consult Bishop Hicke's Preface to his Second Volume of Controversial Letters, pag. 15, 17. Seqq; the first Volume of his Christian Priesthood. pag. 90, 91. the Prefa-

(a) Historical Dissertation prefixed to the Book of Bertram. pag. 51. Lond. 1686.




tory Discourse in the same Volume, pag. 37. seqq; and the Appendix to the Second Volume, pag. 294. Seqq; where he will find the Testimonies of Biskop Andreus, Bishop Laud, Mr. Mede, Dr. Heylin, Bishop Bull, Bishop Beverege, Archbishop Bramhall, Dr. Brough, Mr. Thorndike, and others, produced in Defence of it.



DE

Th  
B  
foll  
the  
my  
An



De forma Consecrationis Eucharistiæ, sive medio, per quod panis & vinum transmutantur in corpus & sanguinem Domini.

*Sententia ac definitio Romanæ Ecclesiæ.*

**B**ELLARMINUS, lib. 4 de Eucharistiâ cap. 12. sententiam Romanæ Ecclesiæ sequentibus pandit verbis: *Est questio, utrum illa sola verba, HOC EST ENIM CORPUS MEUM, & HIC EST ENIM CALIX SANGUINIS, &c. ad formam hujus Sacramenti pertineant. Et quidem Ecclesia Catholica magno consensu*

*Of the Form of the Eucharistical Consecration, or the Means, by which the Bread and Wine are changed into the Body and Blood of the Lord.*

The Opinion and Definition of the Romish Church.

**B**ellarmin in his fourth Book of the Eucharist c. 12. gives us the Sense of the Church of Rome in the following Words: *The Question is, whether the Form of the Sacrament consists only in those Words, For this is my Body, and, for this is the Cup of my Blood, &c. And indeed the Catholick Church does with a general*  
B Voice

sensu docet illa sola verba ad formam pertinere. Ita enim habemus in Concilio Florentino in instructione Armenorum, & in Catechismo Concilii Tridentini, &c. Et in fine capitis expresse docet, Verba Domini, HOC EST ENIM CORPUS MEUM, & HIC EST ENIM CALIX SANGUINIS, &c. necessario requiri, & sola sufficere ad sacramentum Eucharistiae conficiendum; proinde reliqua, quae in Liturgiae actione pronuntiantur, siue sint lectiones, siue preces, utiliter quidem adhiberi ad preparandos animos ad tam magnum mysterium, non tamen in eis vim ullam inesse ad Sacramentum conficiendum. Verba Concilii Florentini in instructione contra Armenos, ad quae Bellarminus provocat, haec sunt, Tom. VIII. Concil. p. 866. col. i. Forma hujus Sacramenti sunt verba Salvatoris, quibus hoc conficitur

*Vice teach, that those Words alone relate to the Form. For thus the Council of Florence taught the Armenians, and it is the Doctrine of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, &c. And at the End of the Chapter he expressly affirms, that the Words of the Lord, for this is my Body, and, for this is the Cup of my Blood, &c. are both absolutely necessary and alone sufficient to consecrate the Eucharist; and that therefore all other Parts of the Liturgical Action, whether Lessons or Prayers, are indeed useful Preparatories to so great a Mystery, but have no Share in the Consecration. The Words of the Council of Florence in the Decree against the Armenians, refer'd to by Bellarmin, are these, Tom. VIII. Concil. p. 866. col. i. The Form of this Sacrament is the Words of our Saviour, by which it is made*



*tar Sacramentum.* Nam ipsorum verborum Virtute Substantia panis in corpus Christi, & substantia vini in sanguinem convertuntur. Accedit, quod Sess. XXV. Concilii Florentini, pag. 845. legamus, duos magistros, quos Papa cum Græcis conferre iussit, de pane Eucharistico disseruisse, quod illum verba Domini consecrent, transmutentq; in corpus Christi, non autem orationes Sacerdotum. Mentionem hujus disceptationis quoq; facit Sguropulus, pag. 278. Seqq. referens, quod in istius quidem Collationis fine nihil certi statutum fuerit, sed cuilibet suo abundare sensu permissum. Deinde verò, p. 293. Seq. narrat controversiam istam, post factam jam unionis Subscriptionem, a Latinis renovatam, atq; hoc modo, quanquam insciis Græcis quamplurimis, finitam esse, ut

Oratio

*a Sacrament.* For by the Force of those Words the Substance of the Bread is changed into the Body of Christ, and the Substance of the Wine into his Blood. Besides Sess. XXV. of the Council of Floren. p. 845. we read that two Masters, who by the Pope's Order had a Conference with the Greeks, maintain'd that the Eucharistical Bread was consecrated and changed into Christ's Body by the Words of our Lord, not by the sacerdotal Prayers. Sguropulus mentions this Dispute, pag. 278. Seq. and observes, that it ended in no certain Determination, but every Body was left to his own Opinion. And afterwards, p. 293. Seq. he tells us, that when the Union was subscribed to, the Latins renewed the Dispute, and it was concluded, tho' without the Knowledge of most of the Greeks, by putting in Writing Bessario of Nice's

Oratio Bessarionis Nicæni ( qui Romanorum partes amplexus erat ) coram Papâ hanc in rem habita, literis mandaretur, essetq; instar confessionis Græcorum edita. Atq; ista Bessarionis oratio satis ambiguis concepta erat verbis, tamen expresse sonabat, *quicquid Sancta Romana Ecclesia in articulo consecrationis Sacramenti credit, idem & nos credimus.* Adeo tenaciter suam sententiam Latini propugnabant, ut cum Græcis unionem inire noluerint, nisi in ipsam conscenderent, utq; hodiernum *pestimum & detestandum errorem* imò *hæresin* appellant sententiam Græcorum, uti Bona appellavit, lib. 2. Rerum Liturg. c. 13. Sec. 4.

Con-

Speech (who had join'd himself to the Romanists) before the Pope upon this Subject, and publishing it as the Confession of the Greeks. Now that very Speech of Bessario's was couch'd in ambiguous Language, but it ran expressly, *whatsoever is the Faith of the Holy Roman Church in the Article of the Sacramental Consecration, the same is ours.* So tenacious were the Latins of their own Opinion, that they refused to unite with the Greeks, unless they submitted to it, and to this Day call the Opinion of the Greeks, *a vile and abominable Error*, nay a *Heresy*, as Bona term'd it. Book 2. of his Liturgical Discourses c. 13. Sect. 4.

The

## *Contraria Sententia Græcorum.*

Quippe Græci contra solâ recitatione verborum Christi, *Hoc est corpus meum, Hic est sanguis meus*, consecrationem elementorum Sacramentalium absolvi negant, ac *uti omnis creatura per verbum & orationem Sanctificatur*, juxta 1. ad Tim. IV. ita etiam ad panis atq; vini Eucharistici consecrationem, partim recitationem verborum Christi, partim orationem, quæ in ipsis fundatur, necessariò requiri docent, uti patet non modo ex Nicolai Cabasilæ expositione Liturgiæ, cap. 27, 29, & 30. Tom. XII. Bibl. M. Patr. Sed et Marci Ephesii peculiari opusculo, cujus inscriptio est, *Quòd non solum a voce Dominicorum verborum*  
*San-*

### *The contrary Opinion of the Greeks.*

The Greeks on the other hand deny, that the Consecration of the Sacramental Elements is perform'd by the mere repetition of Christ's Words, *This is my Body, This is my Blood*, and *as every Creature is sanctified by the Word and by Prayer*, according to 1 Tim. iv. So they teach, that partly the recital of Christ's Words, and partly Prayer, which is founded upon those Words, is necessary to the Consecration of the Eucharistical Bread and Wine, as appears not only from Nicolas Cabasilas's Exposition of the Liturgy, chap. 27, 29, and 30. Tom. XII. Bibl. M. Patr. but also from a particular Piece of Mark of Ephesus, intitul'd, *That the divine*  
*Gifts*



*Sanctificentur divina dona, verum a consequente oratione & benedictione Sacerdotis. Post quos Hieremias Patriarcha Constantinopolitanus, cap. 10. Respons. 1. pag. 86. Invocatione, inquit, & gratia omnipotentis, sacrorumq; rituum antistitis Spiritus, Sacrarum precationum & divinorum Oraculorum interventu, panis quidem in ipsum Domini corpus, vinum verò in ipsum Domini Sanguinem convertitur & transmutatur. Confer. cap. IV. Responsi 2di. pag. 241. Deniq; Gabriel Philadelphiensis, in libro de Sacramentis, quem A. D. 1600. edidit, suam de hac controversia sententiam sequentibus pandit verbis. Forma antecederet quidem sunt verba Dominica, consequenter verò sunt ea etiam, quæ deinceps à sacerdote dicuntur, ut habetur in divina Liturgia. Habemus itaq; con-*

*Gifts are sanctified not only by the Voice of our Lord's Words, but also by the following Prayer and Blessing of the Priest. After whom Jeremy Patriarch of Constantinople, chap. 10. Answer 1. pag. 86. says, that the Bread is converted and changed into the very Body of our Lord, and the Wine into his very Blood by the Grace of the Almighty Spirit, that presides over the divine Worship, through the Mediation of godly Prayers and the divine Oracles. Compare chap. iv. Answer 2. pag. 241. Gabriel of Philadelphia also in his Book of the Sacraments, which he published A. D. 1600. gives his Opinion of this Controversy in the following Words: The Form indeed begins with the Words of our Lord, but consists also in what is afterwards said by the Priest, as may be seen in the divine Liturgy. There are there*

contradictorias propositiones; Siquidem Latini negant precibus Sacerdotis una cum verbis Domini Sacramentum consecrari: Græci verò id affirmant. Unde necessario una harum vera, altera falsa erit. Veram autem existimo affirmativam Græcorum, quoniam pro eâ stat magnus, isq; clarissimus Sanctorum Patrum & Ecclesiarum consensus, cum contra pro Latinorum negativâ ne unus quidem ex S. Scriptoris afferri possit locus, adeo ut rectè Scripserit Nicolaus Cabasilas in fine cap. 29. Tom. XII. Bibl. M. Patrum p. 482. c. *quòd Sermo Domini, qui de mysteriis in formâ narrationis dicitur, sufficiat ad donorum Sanctificationem, nullus neq; Apostolus, neq; Doctor dixisse cernitur.* Et in fine cap. 30. p. 484. c. novitatis

therefore two contradictory Propositions; the Latins deny that the Sacrament is consecrated by the Prayers of the Priest together with the Words of our Lord; and the Greeks affirm, it is. Now one of these must necessarily be true, and the other false. The Affirmative of the Greeks I look upon to be true, because it is supported by a numerous and plain Testimony of holy Fathers and Churches, whereas on the contrary there can no one Text be produced out of those sacred Writers for the Negative of the Latins, so that it was rightly observed by Nicolas Cabasilas, at the End of cap. 29. Tom. XII. Bibl. M. Patrum. p. 482. c. that *there was no Instance of any Apostle or Doctor of the Church, who declared the Words of our Lord, which were spoken of the Mysteries by way of Narration, to be sufficient to consecrate the Gifts.* And at the close of chap. 30. p. 484. c. He

tatis hoc in puncto accusat, non quidem totam Ecclesiam Latinam, sed paucos quosdam & recentiores, qui ei quocq; in aliis detrimentum asserunt, utpote qui ad nihil aliud se tam opportunè gerunt, quam ad aliquid novum dicendum vel audiendum. Similiter Marcus Ephesius, parum à principio libelli, *Apud eorum* (Apostolorum & Doctorum Ecclesiæ) *nullum reperi-*mus, *ab ipsis Dominicis verbis, & quidem solis,* sanctificari ac perfici Eucharistiæ donum. Quin contrarium S. Apostolos eorumq; successores docuisse, ex sequentibus patebit.

Con-

He lays a Charge of Novelty in this Particular, not against the whole Latin Church, but some few Moderns, who in other Cases also disserve her Interest, by troubling themselves with no other Business so much as with speaking and hearing some new thing. So Mark of Ephesus near the Beginning of his Book, we don't find in any of them (the Apostles and Doctors of the Church) that the Eucharistical Gift is completely consecrated by the Words of our Lord, and those merely. But it will appear from what follows, that the Apostles and their Successors taught the contrary.

The



*Consensus Patrum atq; Ecclesiae pro  
Sententia Ecclesiae Graecae.*

Ad hunc consensum ostendendum sufficere possunt Liturgiæ S. Apostolorum & Patrum, quas habemus superstites, atq; plurimas insertas legimus Tom. VI. & XII. Bibl.

M. Patrum. Primo loco adduci meretur Liturgia S. Jacobi, fratris Domini, quam genuinam esse peculiari dissertatione probavit Leo Allatius. In eâ autem aliquanto post recitata verba in-

1. Liturgiarnm Antiquarum omnium pro sententia Græcorum contra Ecclesiam Romanam Testimonia.

1. Liturgiæ, quæ S. Jacobo attribuitur, pro Græcis testimonium.

stitutionis

*The consentient Testimony of the Fathers and of  
the Church, for the Opinion of the Greek  
Church.*

For Proof of this Testimony, the Liturgies of the holy Apostles and Fathers, which are still remaining, and most of them inserted in the VI and XII

Tomes of the Bibl. M. Patrum may suffice. The Liturgy of S. James, the Brother of our Lord, which Leo Allatius has in a particular Discourse proved to be genuine, deserves the first Place in the Collection. There, a few Lines

1. The Testimonies of all the ancient Liturgies for the Opinion of the Greeks against the Latin Church.

1. The Testimony of the Liturgy ascribed to S. James, for the Greeks.

after

stitutionis Sacerdos orat, Tom. XII. Bibl. M. Patr. p. 254. Seqq. *Miserere nostri Deus secundum magnam misericordiam tuam, & demitte super nos, & super hæc dona proposita Spiritum tuum sanctissimum, — ut superveniens Sancta & bona & gloriosa sua præsentia Sanctificet & efficiat (αγιασῇ ἡ, ποιῇ) hunc panem corpus Sanctum Christi tui, & calicem hunc pretiosum Sanguinem Christi tui, ut sit omnibus ex his summentibus in remissionem peccatorum, & in vitam æternam, in sanctificationem animarum & corporum.* Neq; aliter se habet Liturgia Marci, quæ dubia quidem, attamen non manifestè Supposititia est, in qua sacerdos eodem ordine post sacram historiam, &

2. Pro eorum sententia Liturgia Marci S. Ecclesiæ Alexandrinæ adducitur:

after reciting the Words of Institution, the Priest prays, Tom. XII. Bibl. M. Patr. p. 254. Seqq. *Have Mercy upon us O God, according to thy great Mercy, and send down upon us, and upon these Gifts, which are here set before thee, thy most holy Spirit, — that by the descent of his holy, good and glorious Presence, he may sanctify and make this Bread the holy Body of thy Christ, and this Cup the precious Blood of thy Christ, that all, who are partakers thereof, may obtain remission of their Sins, and eternal Life, may be sanctified in Soul and Body.* The same also we find in S. Mark's Liturgy, which, tho' a disputed Piece, is not evidently supposititious, where the Priest in the same Manner having repeated the sacred History, and pronounced the Words

2. The Liturgy of S. Mark, used by the Church of Alexandria, is produced for their Opinion.

& recitata verba Domini paulo post rogat, T. XII. Bibl. M. Patr. pag. 278. *Emitte præterea super nos, & super panes istos, & calices istos, Spiritum Sanctum tuum, ut eos sanctificet & consecret, tanquam Deus Omnipotens, & faciat panem quidem corpus, calicem autem sanguinem Novi Testamenti ipsius Domini & Dei & servatoris & summi Regis nostri Jesu Christi; ut fiant omnibus nobis, qui ex iis participamus, in fidem, in sobrietatem, in medelam, in temperantiam, in sanctificationem, in renovationem animæ, corporis, & spiritus, in communionem beatitudinis vite æternæ & immortalitatis.*

Similiter in Liturgiâ insertâ Clementis Constitutionibus Apostolicis lib. VIII. cap. 12. Sa-

3. Vetusissima Constitutionibus Apostolicis inserta Liturgia.

cerdos verbis Domini paulo ante prolatis mox  
ita

Words of our Lord, soon after prays thus, T. XII. Bibl. M. Patr. p. 278. *Send down moreover upon us, and upon these Loaves, and these Cups, thine holy Spirit, that us Almighty God, he may sanctify and consecrate them, and make the Bread the Body, and the Cup the Blood of the New Testament of our Lord himself, and God, and Saviour, and supreme King Jesus Christ, that they may be to all us, who are partakers thereof, the Means of Faith, Sobriety, Health, Temperance, Sanctification, the renewing of our Soul, Body, and Spirit, the Communion of the blessed State of eternal Life and Immortality.* So in the Liturgy inserted in the Apostolical Constitutions of Clement, Book VIII. c. 12. The Priest having a little before pronounced the Words of our Lord, thus ad-

3. The most ancient Liturgy inserted in the Apostolical Constitutions.



ita Deum precatur, Rogamus te, ut benignè ad-  
spicere digneris super hæc dona proposita in con-  
spectu tuo—& mittas Sanctum Spiritum tuum  
super hoc sacrificium testem passionum Domini Je-  
su, ut efficiat (ὅπως ἀποφύγῃ) hunc panem corpus  
Christi tui, & hunc calicem sanguinem Christi  
tui. Porro in S. Gregorii Na-

4. S. Gregorii Na-  
zianzeni Liturgia.

zianzeni Theologi Liturgiâ,  
Tom. VI. Biblioth. M. Patr.

col. 91. Sacerdos post narrationem institutionis  
Eucharistiæ rogat Deum sequentibus verbis,  
*Præpara nobis mysterium plenum mysteriis, infere  
in nobis memoriam mysterii tui sancti, mitte su-  
per nos gratiam S Spiritus tui, qui purificet, &  
commutet has propositas oblationes in corpus &  
sanguinem liberationis nostræ, & hic panis fiat  
corpus sacrosanctum tuum, Domine Deus, & sal-*  
vator

dresses God, *We beseech thee to look graciously on these  
Gifts now lying before thee — and to send thine  
holy Spirit, the Witness of the Sufferings of the Lord  
Jesus upon this Sacrifice, that he may make this  
Bread the Body of thy Christ, and this Cup the Blood of  
thy Christ.* In the Liturgy also of

4. S. Gregory Na-  
zianzen's Liturgy.

S. Gregory Nazianzen the Di-  
vine, Tom. VI. Biblioth. M. Patr.

col. 91. The Priest after repeating the Eucharisti-  
cal Institution makes the following Prayer to God,  
*Prepare us a Sacrament full of Mysteries, implant in us  
the Remembrance of thy holy Mystery, send down upon us  
the Grace of thy holy Spirit, that he may purify and  
change these Oblations here set before thee, into the Body  
and Blood of our Redemption, and that this Bread may  
become thy most sacred Body, O Lord our God and Savi-*

our

vator noster, Jesu Christe ; detur in remissionem peccatorum & vitam æternam sumentibus eum ; & hic calix itidem sanguinis pretiosi Testamenti novi, ut tu Domine, Deus & Salvator noster, Jesu Christe, des in remissionem peccatorum, & in vitam æternam sumentibus ex eo. In S. Basilii Liturgiâ itidem post verba insti-

tutionis Sacerdos ita orat, 5. Basilii Liturgia. Tom. XII. Bibl. M. Patr. p.

291. *Confidentes sancto tuo altari appropinquamus, & propositis iis, quæ sanctum corpus & sanguinem Christi tui representant* (ἡ, *we cδeiles τὰ ἀντίτυπα τῆς ἀγίας σωμας & αἱμας & τῆς χρεως* &c) *te rogamus, & te obsecramus, Sancte Sanctorum, per tuæ bonitatis placitum, ut Spiritus Sanctus tuus ad nos veniat, & ad hæc dona proposita, & ea benedicat, & sanctificet, & consecret,*

*our, Jesu Christ ; let it be given to all that partake of it for remission of Sins and eternal Life ; and that this Cup may be the Cup of the precious Blood of the New Testament. Do thou, O Lord our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, give it to all that partake of it for the remission of their Sins and eternal Life.*

In like manner in S. Basil's Liturgy 5. Basil's Liturgy. after the Words of Institution the

Priest prays thus, Tom. XII. Bibl. M. Patr.

p. 291. *We approach with Boldness thy Holy Altar, and laying before thee these Symbols of the Holy Body and Blood of thy Christ, we pray and beseech thee, O thou Holy of Holies, of thy gracious Goodness to send down thine holy Spirit upon us and upon these Gifts set before thee, to bless, sanctify and consecrate*

cret, αραδ' εἶσαι, panem hunc ipsum pretiosum corpus Domini & Dei & Servatoris nostri, Jesu Christi, qui pro mundi vitâ effusus est, Mutans

6. Anaphora Syrorum.

Græca, adhibet

7. S. Johannis Chrysostomi Liturgia.

Spiritu tuo sancto. Anaphora

Syrorum, i. e. S. Basilii Liturgia Syriaca, eadem, quæ

17. C. Eodem modo in Liturgia Sancti Johannis Chrysostomi Tom. XII. Bibl. M. Patr.

p. 319. Te rogamus, inquit Sacerdos, & oramus, & supplicamus, demitte Spiritum tuum Sanctum in nos, & in hæc dona proposita, fac panem hunc pretiosum corpus Christi tui, quod autem est in hoc calice, pretiosum Sanguinem Christi tui, mutans Spiritu tuo Sancto, ut sit iis qui participant, ad emundationem animæ, ad remissionem

crate them, to make this Bread the precious Body of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, who was poured out for the Life of the World, changing

6. The Syriack Anaphora.

the Greek.

7. S. John Chrysostome's Liturgy.

it by thy holy Spirit. The Syriack Anaphora, i. e. the Syriack Liturgy of S. Basil is the same with

So also in S. John Chrysostome's Liturgy. Tom. XII. Bibl. M. Patr. p. 319. We beg, says the

Priest, and pray and beseech thee, send down thine holy Spirit upon us and upon these Gifts lying before thee; make this Bread the precious Body of thy Christ, and what is in this Cup the precious Blood of thy Christ, changing it by thy holy Spirit, that it may be to those who partake of it, for the purification of their Souls, for remission



nein peccatorum, ad communionem S. Spiritus, ad regni cœlorum complementum, in fiduciam apud te, non in iudicium aut condemnationem.

Deniq; in Liturgiâ S. Cyrilli Alexandrini ita oratur. Tom. VI. Bibl. M. Patr.

8. S. Cyrilli Alex.  
Liturgia.

col. 101. *Emitte de excelso sancto tuo & de habitaculo preparato incomprehensibili in sinu tuo, & de throno regni gloriæ tuæ ipsum Paracletum, & Spiritum sanctum tuum super nos famulos tuos, & super has oblationes venerandas, quas incipio apponere coram te, super hunc panem, & super hunc calicem, ut sanctificentur & commutentur, & hunc panem faciat corpus sanctum Christi tui, & hunc calicem etiam pretiosum novi Testamenti, Domini Dei & salvatoris nostri & Regis omnium nostrum, Jesu Christi, ut sint nobis omnibus sumentibus*

remission of Sins, for the Communion of the Holy Ghost, for the Fulness of the Kingdom of Heaven, for Confidence in thee, not for Judgement or Condemnation.

Lastly in S. Cyril of Alexandria's

Liturgy there is this Prayer. 8. S. Cyril of A-  
Tom. VI. Bibl. M. Patr. col. lexandria's Liturgy.

101. *Send down from thine high and holy Seat, from the Habitation prepared in thine incomprehensible Bosom, from the glorious Throne of thy Kingdom, the Paraclete, and thine holy Spirit, upon us thy Servants, and upon these venerable Oblations, which I am setting before thee, that they may be sanctified and changed, and that he may make this Bread the holy Body of thy Christ, and this Cup the precious Cup of the new Testament of our Lord God and Saviour, and the King of us all Jesus Christ, that they may be to all us who partake of*

*mentibus ex eis fides sine investigatione, charitas non ficta, patientia perfecta, spes firma & fiducia, custodia, gaudium & renovatio animi, corporis, & Spiritus, gloria nominis tui sancti, & participatio beata in vitâ eternâ, & liberatio ab interitu, & remissio peccatorum.*

Ex quibus Liturgiis omnibus luce clarius elucescit, harum Authores S. Apostolos & Patres haud credidisse, consecrationem Eucharistiæ solâ recitatione verborum Christi perfici atq; absolvi; si enim per istam recitationem Symbolâ sacramentalia jam plenè consecrata atq; in corpus & sanguinem Christi verè commutata sunt, frustraneum est ac inane post enuntiata ista Christi verba adhuc sollicitè Deum rogare, orare, ipsi supplicare, ut demisso coelitus Spiritu sancto panem atq; vinum sanctificet,

*of them, Faith without scruple, unfeigned Charity, perfect Patience, firm Hope and Confidence, Security, Joy and the renewal of Mind, Body and Spirit, the glory of thy holy Name, and a blessed participation of eternal Life, deliverance from Death and the remission of our Sins.*

From all which Liturgies it evidently appears, that the holy Apostles and Fathers who compiled them, did not believe the Consecration of the Eucharist to be perfected and finished by the mere recital of Christ's Words; for if the Sacramental Symbols are fully consecrated and changed into the Body and Blood of Christ by that recital, it is to no Purpose after those Words of Christ are pronounced. to beg, pray, and earnestly to beseech God to send down his holy Spirit from above, that he may sanctify, consecrate and transmute the Bread and Wine

ificet, consecret, atq; in corpus & sanguinem Christi transmutet; imo quæ jam mutata & facta sunt corpus & sanguis Domini non possunt adhuc mutari & fieri talia. Equidem Romanæ Ecclesiæ Doctores unâ cum Bessarione vel quinq; exceptiones adversus hæc proferunt, ac in diversa abeunt, haud bonæ causæ indicio: Sed ipse Bellarminus, lib. IV. de Eucharistiâ cap. 14. duas Bessarionis, ceu minus solidas, rejicit, sunt enim manifestæ detorsiones; ac reliquas tres affert objectiones, quarum primæ ipse diffidit, adjiciens *sed fortasse*, repudiant itidem Vasquez, de Lugo, & Suárez, qui ingenuè fatetur, *Responsio hæc inventa est ad vitandam argumenti vim, sed nullâ conjecturâ nititur.* Secundam ex institu-  
to

Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ; nay, those Elements which are already changed, and made the Body and Blood of our Lord, cannot again be changed and made such: The Doctors of the Romish Church together with Bessario do indeed make five Exceptions to what is here said, and differ in their Determinations, which is no Mark of a good Cause: But Bellarmin himself, Book iv. of the Eucharist, c. 14. rejects two of Bessario's for their want of Solidity, for they are manifest Mistakes, and brings three other Objections, the first of which he speaks diffidently of, adding *a perhaps* to it; it is also rejected by Vasquez, de Lugo, and Suarez, who ingenuously acknowledges, *This Answer was found out to avoid the Force of the Argument, but is grounded upon no probability.* The  
D second



to refellit Vasquez, ac de Lugo quoq; rejicit, nec Bellarminus ipsam urgere videtur, unde addit, *Tertia solutio, eaq; omnium solidissima, est, per ea verba non peti absolute, ut panis fiat corpus Domini, sed ut nobis fiat, i. e. ut panis ille consecratus, qui revera jam est in se corpus Domini, fiat per effectum nutritionis Spiritualis etiam nobis corpus Domini.* Missis igitur aliis Latinorum exceptionibus, hanc, quam Bellarminus solidissimam putat, quamq; Suarez *præcipuam* appellat, & Vasquez quoq; sibi magis probari affirmat, alios ut taceam, hanc, inquam, considerandam fumo. Et ipsa autem mihi prorsus violenta videtur esse verborum explicatio. Posito enim *to nobis*, quod tamen in nullo citatorum textuum legitur, hic subin-

second Vasquez purposely refutes, and de Lugo rejects, nor does Bellarmin seem to urge it, whence he adds, *The third Solution, which is the best, is, that by those Words we do not absolutely desire, that the Bread may be made the Body of the Lord, but that it may be made so to us, that is, that the consecrated Bread, which in it self is already the Body of the Lord, may be also the Body of the Lord to us by the Effect of a spiritual Nutrition.* To omit therefore other Exceptions made by the Latins, this, which Bellarmin looks upon as the strongest, which Suarez calls *the chief*, and Vasquez affirms to be best proved, to take no Notice of others, this, I say, I shall undertake the Consideration of. The Construction then of the Words seems to me very forced. For supposing the Words *to us*, which yet no where occur in the Passages above cited, were here to be understood,

so

subintelligendum esse, ita ut sacerdos roget Deum, velit panem nobis facere corpus Christi, vinum nobis facere sanguinem Christi, tamen etiam istis verbis adhuc ipsa postularetur consecratio: Neque enim *to nobis* nativam significationem demit phrasibus *consecrare*, atq; *ex pane & vino facere corpus & sanguinem Christi*, sed ista manente solum connotat finem cui, sive in cuius gratiam atq; usum consecratio ista efflagitetur, uti postea prolixius monstrabo. Deinde, quod bene notandum, ceu ad refutationem istius expositionis planè sufficiens, in istis Liturgiis petitur a Deo, non simpliciter & nudè, ut nobis fiat corpus & sanguis Christi, sed ut panis & vinum *immutentur Spiritu sancto*, & sic fiant corpus & Sanguis Do-

so that the Priest should petition God to make the Bread the Body of Christ to us, and to make the Wine the Blood of Christ to us, yet would a Consecration be required by those Words: For the Expressions of *consecrating* and *making the Body and Blood of Christ of the Bread and Wine* can never lose their natural Signification by the Addition of *to us*; but that remaining, this Addition only denotes the End to which, or for the Sake and Use of which that Consecration is desired, as I shall shew more fully hereafter. Besides, which should be well observed, as manifestly sufficient to confute that Exposition, in those Liturgies God is desired, not simply and barely to make to us the Body and Blood of Christ, but to *change* the Bread and Wine *by the holy Ghost*, and so to make them the Body and Blood of the Lord. But a Change of

Domini. Ast immutatio Symbolorum sacramentalium est passio seu affectio eorum propria & absoluta, quæ alterationem in seipsis liquido significat, non autem efficaciam & fructum in nobis. Neque eo ipso, dum corpus & Sanguis Christi nobis fiunt Spirituale nutrimentum, panis & vinum demum mutatur in corpus & sanguinem Christi, sed hoc jam antefit, & ab altero est distinctum : hoc fit in Altari ante perceptionem Sacramenti, istud in nobis in ipsâ perceptione & post ipsam. Quapropter, quando sacerdos Deum juxta præscriptum S. Apostolorum rogat, ut per Spiritum Sanctum Sacramentalia Symbola Sanctificet, & panem atq; vinum mutet in Sacramentum corporis Sanguinisq; Domini, non potest hic istorum verborum sensus esse, ut corpus

the Sacramental Symbols is a proper and absolute Passion or Affection of them, which plainly signifies an Alteration in them, not an Efficacy or Fruit in us. Nor is the Bread and Wine then changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, when the Body and Blood of Christ are made a spiritual Food to us, but that is done before, and is a distinct Action from the other: The one is made upon the Altar before the Sacramental Participation, the other in us at the Time of the Participation, and after it. When therefore the Priest beseeches God, according to the Direction of the holy Apostles, to sanctify the Sacramental Symbols by the Holy Ghost, and to change the Bread and Wine into the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord, those Words cannot mean, that the Body  
and



pus & sanguis Domini nobis fiant corpus & sanguis Domini, sive nobis cedant in spirituale nutrimentum. Quis hæc non videat planè diversa esse? Unde & factum, ut hæc diversis verbis atq; precibus à Deo in sacris Liturgiis postulentur, siquidem post orationem de pane & vino sanctificandis, atq; in corpus sanguinemque Domini transmutandis, mox distincta ac peculiaria in istis Liturgiis sequantur verba, quibus oratur, ut dona sic consecrata nobis ad Spiritualem nutritionem & salutem nostram prosint, ceu ex recitatis textibus patet: liquidior autem adhuc res evadit ex S. Basilii Liturgiâ, ubi duplex habetur oratio; prior quidem, quâ sacerdos sacra dona a Spiritu sancto mutari, ac in corpus & sanguinem Domini converti precatur; posterior paucis interjectis sequitur, quâ rogatur

and Blood of the Lord should be made the Body and Blood of the Lord to us, or should become our spiritual Sustenance. Who does not see that these two Things are plainly different? And hence it is, that they are desired of God in different Words and Prayers in the sacred Liturgies; for after the Prayer for sanctifying the Bread and Wine and changing them into the Body and Blood of the Lord, there follows a distinct and peculiar Petition in those Liturgies, that the Gifts so consecrated may be profitable to us for spiritual Nourishment and our Salvation, as appears from the Passages above mentioned: But S. Basil's Liturgy will set the Matter still in a clearer light, where there are two Prayers, one, in which the Priest prays that the sacred Gifts may be changed and turn'd into the Body and Blood of Christ; the other follows a few Words

ut sibi & coeteris communicantibus salutaris sit Sacramenti sumptio. Hæc enim immediate post verba superius recitata sequuntur. Nos autem omnes, qui ex uno pane & calice participamus, iunge ad invicem in unius Spiritus communionem, & fac, ut nemo nostrum ad iudicium vel ad condemnationem sit particeps corporis & sanguinis Christi tui, sed ut inveniamus misericordiam & gratiam cum omnibus Sanctis, qui a seculo tibi placuerunt. Hæc igitur inter se non debent confundi. Missis aliis, quæ ulterius opponi possent, id unicum ad refutationem allatæ exceptionis addo : Nimirum S. Patres magno numero affirmant, Eucharistiam consecrari & confici prece sacerdotali atq; invocatione Spiritus Sancti, ut mox vide-

Words after, in which he prays, that the taking of the Sacrament may be to the Salvation of himself and the other Communicants. For after the Words above-quoted immediately follows. *Unite all us who partake of this one Bread, and Cup, in the Communion of one Spirit, and suffer none of us to partake of the Body and Blood of thy Christ to our Judgment or Condemnation, but that we may find Mercy and Grace with all thy Saints, who have pleased thee from the beginning of the World.* Since then there is a plain difference between them, they ought not to be confounded. To omit other Objections, which might be urged, I shall only add one thing more against the Exception alledged : Which is, that a great Number of the holy Fathers affirm, that the Eucharist is consecrated and finish'd by the Prayer of the Priest and the Invocation of the holy Spirit,

videbimus, atq; ita non respectu utilitatis nostræ, sed absolutè loquuntur, ut res ipsa clamat, & Romanæ Ecclesiæ Doctores fatentur. At verò dubium non est, S. Patres præsertim, quando dicunt, invocatione Spiritûs Sancti Eucharistiam consecrari, sive symbola Sacramentalia transmutari, respicere ad istam orationem supra positam, quâ Sacerdotes in Liturgiis Deum invocant, ut demisso Spiritu Sancto panem & vinum consecret, atq; efficiat ea corpus & sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Unde patet, S. Patres istam orationem de ipsâ consecratione intellexisse, contra quem ipsorum sensum alium novum comminisci non decet, præsertim talem, qui ipsis verbis non con-

as we shall see by and by; and therefore do not speak with regard to our Advantage, but absolutely, as the Thing it self proclaims, and the Doctors of the Romish Church acknowledge. But it cannot be doubted, but the holy Fathers especially, when they say that the Eucharist is consecrated, or the Sacramental Symbols changed by the Invocation of the holy Spirit, allude to the Prayer above cited, in which, the Priests in the Liturgies call upon God to send down his Holy Spirit to consecrate the Bread and Wine, and make them the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. Whence it appears, that the holy Fathers meant by that Prayer the Consecration it self, and against this Sense of them no new one ought to be devised, especially such an one, as agrees not with the Words themselves, which I think I have sufficiently



conveniat, qualem istum a Bellarmino allatum esse, satis me probasse puto.

Neque rem probare possunt rationes a Bellarmino allatae. Prima est, quia in Liturgia Clementis & Basilii non dicitur, Fac panem istum corpus Christi, sed ostende panem istum corpus Christi. Neque dubium est, quin Jacobi & Chrysostomi Liturgiae, quae habent Fac, idem significare voluerint. Porro, Ostende panem esse corpus Domini, significat, Ostende per effectum Salutarem in mentibus nostris istum panem sanctificatum non esse panem vulgarem sed celestem. Respondetur negando in Liturgiis Clementis & Basilii haberi, Ostende panem istum corpus Christi. Prior habet, ὅπως ἀποφάνη τὸν ἄρτον τέλει σῶμα τοῦ χριστοῦ σὺ. Posterior,

ently proved of that which is alledged by Bellarmin.

Nor can Bellarmin's Reasons prove his Point. The first is, because in S. Clement and S. Basil's Liturgies it is not said, make this Bread the Body of Christ, but shew this Bread to be the Body of Christ. Nor can it be question'd but S. James and S. Chrysostome's Liturgies, which use the Word ~~Make~~, mean the same thing. Now, shew the Bread to be the Body of the Lord is as much as to say, shew by the salutary Effect of this sanctified Bread in our Minds, that it is not common but celestial Bread. I answer, by denying that Clement's and Basil's Liturgys have the Expression, Shew this Bread to be the Body of Christ. In the first it is, ὅπως ἀποφάνη τὸν ἄρτον τέλει σῶμα τῷ χριστῷ σὺ. In the other, εὐλογεῖσαι, ἀγιάσαι,

ὄν, εὐλογῆσαι, ἀγιάσαι, ἀναθεῖξαι. Jam ἀποφά-  
 νειν Clementis, & ἀναθεῖξαι Basilii, uti Vas-  
 quez agnoscit, non modo significat *ostendere*,  
 sed & *efficere* atq; *consecrare*, id quod Perroni-  
 us Romano-Catholicus, lib. II. de Eucharistiâ,  
 Auctorit. XV. egregiè duobus ex Theodoro  
 exemplis atq; è Strabone probavit, cum quo  
 conferat Lexicographos, qui plura desiderat  
 exempla. Quod autem in hac de Eucharistiâ  
 tractatione ista verba non *ostendendi*, sed *effici-*  
*endi* & *consecrandi* significationem habeant, Per-  
 ronius confirmavit auctoritate antiqui interpre-  
 tis apud Burchardum, lib. III. cap. 12. quibus  
 adstipulati quoq; recentiores Interpretes, Tur-  
 rianus in versione Clementis, Gentianus Her-  
 vetus & Goar in versione Liturgiæ Basilianæ

in

ἀγιάσαι, ἀναθεῖξαι. Now the ἀποφάινειν of Cle-  
 ment, and the ἀναθεῖξαι of Basil, not only signi-  
 fy to *shew*, but also to *make* and *consecrate*, as Vas-  
 quez acknowledges, and Perronius a Roman-Ca-  
 tholick has notably proved by two Instances from  
 Theodoret, and also from Strabo, Book II. of the  
 Eucharist, Authorit. XV. And he that would see  
 more Examples of it may compare him with the  
 Lexicographers. But that those Words in this  
 Eucharistical Action do not signify *shewing*, but  
*making* and *consecrating*, Perronius has proved by  
 the Authority of an ancient Translator in Burchard,  
 Book III. chap. 12. With whom agree the mo-  
 dern Interpreters, Turrianus in his Version of Cle-  
 ment, Gentianus Hervetus and Goar, in their  
 Translation of S. Basil's Liturgy, in the Bibliothe-  
 ca Patrum, and the Greek Euchology, not to men-

E

tion

in Bibliothecâ Patrum & Eucholog. Græcorum, Andream Masium aliosq; ut taceam, qui omnes non per *ostendere*, sed per *conficere*, *consecrare*, verterunt. Ne tamen solâ autoritate niti videar, addam rationes manifestissimas, 1<sup>o</sup>. quia eo loco, ubi Clemens & Basilius dicunt ἀποφαίνειν, & ἀναδέξαι, Liturgiæ Jacobi, Marci, Chrysostomi, &c. habent ποιῆν, εὐλογῆν, ἀγιάζειν, τελειοῦν. Cum ergo, ipso Bellarmino fatente, dubium non sit, omnes unum idemq; intendisse, verbaq; hæc ποιῆν, εὐλογῆν, &c. semper significant *efficere*, *benedicere*, *consecrare*, &c. nunquam autem *ostendere*, sole clarius est, in Clementis & Basilii Liturgiis voces ἀποφαίνειν & ἀναδέξαι accipiendas esse pro *efficere* sive *consecrare*, non autem pro *ostendere*.

Ita

tion Andrew Masius and others, who all translate it, not *to shew*, but *to make*, *to consecrate*. But not to depend solely upon Authority, I shall add some undeniable Reasons; first, because in the Place, where Clement and Basil use the Terms ἀποφαίνειν, and ἀναδέξαι, the Liturgies of James, Mark and Chrysostom, &c. use ποιῆν, εὐλογῆν, ἀγιάζειν, τελειοῦν. Since then by Bellarmin's own Confession, it cannot be doubted but all of them meant one and the same thing, and the Words ποιῆν, εὐλογῆν, &c. always signify *to make*, *to bless*, *to consecrate*, &c. and never *to shew*, it is evident that the Terms ἀποφαίνειν and ἀναδέξαι in Clement and Basil's Liturgies are to be construed *to make* or *consecrate* and not *to shew*. So then the obscure and equivocal Expressions in Clement and Basil are to be

ex-



Ita igitur ex claris & simplicibus Jacobi, Marci, Chrysostomi verbis explicanda sunt Clementis & Basilii obscura & homonyma, non contra ex his illa, uti Bellarminus facere intendit. Quod in Specie Liturgiam Basilii attinet, post petitionem ἀνάσσειας τῷ ἁγίῳ, immediate additur, *mutans illum Spiritu tuo*, quæ phrasis manifestè ipsam consecrationem, non verò ostensionem per salutarem effectum intelligendam esse evincit. Accedit, quod juxta exemplar Jacobi Goar in Euchologio Græcorum p. 169. immediate sequatur, *panem quidem hunc fac ipsum pretiosum corpus Domini*, τὸν μὲν ἅγιον τῷ ἁγίῳ ποίησον αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον σῶμα κυρίου, quæ vox ποίησον in plurimis Mss. à Goar in Notis ad hunc locum adductis legitur, in Biblioth. verò Patrum Parisiis editâ haud conspicitur, quanquam Mss. Regis Galliæ etiam τὸ ποίησον habeant, teste

Goar

explained by the simple and plain Language of James, Mark and Chrysostom, and not this by them, as Bellarmin would have it. And in particular, as to Basil's Liturgy, after the Prayer ἀνάσσειας τῷ ἁγίῳ, immediately follows, *changing it by thy Spirit*, which Phrase manifestly proves it to mean the Consecration, and not a shewing it to be Christ's Body by its salutary Effect. Besides, according to James Goar's Copy in the Greek Euchologion, p. 169. there immediately follows, *make this Bread the very precious Body of the Lord*; which Word *make* is to be seen in most of the Mss. produced by Goar in his Notes upon this Place, but does not appear in the Bibliotheca Patrum published at Paris, tho' the King of France's Mss.

Goar loc. cit. Secundam rationem Bellarminus sequentibus proponit verbis, *Secundo, idem patet ex similibus precibus, sed clarioribus, quæ habentur in Liturgiâ Latinâ. Nam ante consecrationem dicitur, Fiat nobis corpus & sanguis; non autem Fiat, simpliciter; & post consecrationem iterum petimus idem per illa verba, Jube hæc perferri per manus Sancti Angeli tui in sublime altare tuum, &c. ubi id solum petimus, ut sacrificium nobis sit utile. Respondeo, istâ oratione Romanæ Liturgiæ ubi rogatur, Fiat nobis hæc oblatio corpus & sanguis dilecti filii tui, non id solum peti, ut sacrificium nobis sit utile, sed duas simul comprehendi petitiones, quæ in cæteris Liturgiis, tum disparatis clausulis, tum fusioribus verbis, exprimuntur:*

have themselves the Word *make*, as Goar testifies in the Place before referr'd to. Bellarmin's second Objection is in these Words, *Secondly, it may be proved from the same kind of Prayers, but those more express, which are used in the Latin Liturgy; for before Consecration we say, let it be made the Body and Blood to us, and not simply let it be made; and after Consecration we make the same Petition in these Words, command these Gifts to be carried up by the Hands of thy Angel upon thine exalted Altar, &c. where we only desire that the Sacrifice may be to our Advantage. I answer, that in that Prayer of the Romish Liturgy, where they petition, let this Oblation be made to us the Body and Blood of thy beloved Son, they don't only desire that the Sacrifice may be to their Advantage, but it comprehends two Petitions, which in the other Liturgies are expressed more largely and in distinct*  
Para-

muntur: priorem quidem, ut panis & vinum mutentur & fiant corpus & sanguis Domini, posteriorem, ut nobis sive in nostrum usum id fiant, videlicet per effectum nutritionis spiritualis. Nam, ut supra dixi, *τὸ nobis* prioris petitionis sensum non tollit, sed posteriorem simul connotat, quod ex similibus loquendi formulis liquet, v.g. cum Sutori dico, *fac mihi calceum*, & finem cui significo, atq; duo postulo, 1<sup>o</sup> ut conficiatur calceus, 2<sup>o</sup> ut in meum usum cedat. Similiter cum coquum rogo, ut paret mihi hoc vel illud ferculum, hic est sensus, 1<sup>o</sup> ut cibum istud præparet, 2<sup>o</sup> ut in usum meum, sive propter nutritionem meam id faciat; hoc enim *τὸ mihi* indigitat. Atq; ita hic etiam se res habet; neq; ut Bel-  
larminus

Paragraphs: The first is, that the Bread and Wine may be changed and become the Body and Blood of the Lord, the other, that they may be so to us, or for our Advantage, namely, by the Effect of a spiritual Nutrition. For, as I before observed, the Words *to us* don't destroy the Sense of the former Petition, but connect the latter to it, as may be shewn from some parallel Expressions; for Instance, when I say to a Shoemaker, *make me a Shoe*, I denote both the Action, and the End of that Action, and require two Things, 1. That a Shoe may be made. 2. That it may be for my use. So when I bid the Cook get me a Plate of Meat, the Meaning is, 1. That he should dress that Meat, 2. That he should do it for my Use or Diet; for thus much is signified by the Word *me*. And the Case is the same here; we don't only desire



larminus ait, id solum citatâ oratione petitur, ut sacrificum nobis sit utile, sed & ipsum simul, imo 1<sup>o</sup>. postulatur, ut panis & vinum fiat Sacrificium corporis & sanguinis Domini. Quod ex integro istius orationis contextu & commentatoribus in illum liquido patet. Integer contextus ita sonat; *Quam oblationem tu Deus in omnibus, quæsumus, benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque, facere digneris, ut nobis corpus & sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii tui, Domini Dei nostri Jesu Christi.* Cujus orationis eundem, quem verba ex variis Liturgiis supra citata habent, sensum esse, ac eandem ipsam panis & vini mutationem seu consecrationem postulari, docet Florus Secul. IX. scriptor, ob excellentem doc-

fire, as Bellarmin says, in the Prayer above cited, that the Sacrifice may be to our Advantage, but we also, nay in the first Place petition, that the Bread and Wine may be made the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Lord, which is evident from the whole Context of that Prayer, and the Commentator's upon it. The intire Context runs thus. *Which Oblation do thou, O God, we beseech thee, vouchsafe to render in all respects, blessed, approved, confirmed, reasonable and acceptable, that it may be made unto us the Body and Blood of thy most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ.* Now that this Prayer has the same Meaning with the Words above cited from the several Liturgies, and Petitions for the same Change or Consecration of the Bread and Wine, we are taught by Florus a Writer of the ninth Century, called Master, for the Excellency of his

doctrinam Magister dictus, in expositione Missæ, Tom. VI. Bibl. M. Patr. col. 170. C. hanc orationem sequentibus explicans verbis, *Oratur omnipotens Deus, ut oblationem suis sacris altaribus impositam, & tantum precibus commendatam ipse per VIRTUTEM Spiritus descendentis ita legitimam & perfectam Eucharistiam efficiat.* Mox addit ibi rogari, ut quævis de simplicibus terræ frugibus sumpta (hostia) divine benedictionis ineffabili potentiâ efficiatur fidelibus corpus & sanguis unigeniti filii Dei, sicut ipse testatur; *Caro mea verè est cibus, sanguis meus verè est potus.* Hoc corpus & hic sanguis non in Spicis & sarmentis colligitur, sed certâ consecratione mysticus fit, nobis non nascitur, cum panis & vini creatura in sacramentum carnis & sanguinis

his Doctrine, who in his Exposition of the Mass, Tom. VI. Bibl. M. Patr. col. 170. C. gives the following Explication of this Prayer, *God Almighty is intreated to make the Oblation, which is placed upon his holy Altar, and only dedicated by Prayer, the intire and perfect Eucharist by the Virtue of his descending Spirit.* Afterwards he adds, that Prayer is there made, that every (Sacrifice) taken from the plain Fruits of the Earth may be made the Body and Blood of the only begotten Son of God to the Faithful, by the ineffable Power of the divine Benediction, as he himself testifies, *my Flesh is Meat indeed, my Blood is Drink indeed.* This Body and this Blood is not found in the Ears of Corn, and the Branches of the Vine; the Mystery follows the Consecration, and is not produced with the Element; for the Creature of Bread and Wine is changed into the Sacrament of his Flesh and Blood by the ineffable

*sanguinis ejus ineffabili Spiritus sanctificatione transfertur.* Eadem fere verba habet in suo de celebratione Missæ tractatu Remigius Antissiodorensis eodem Tom. VI. Bibl. M. Patr. col. 451. & alia in ulteriorem explicationem addit, nimirum a Sacerdote orari, ut Deus sacram oblationem panis & vini dignetur facere *benedictam*, i. e. ut tu eam benedicere digneris; *Ratam*, i. e. judices eam dignam tibi ut transeat in corpus filii tui; *Rationabilem*, ille quidem panis & illud vinum per se irrationabile est, sed orat Sacerdos, ut ab illo rationabiliter tractatus, & ab omnipotenti Deo consecratus, rationabilis fiat, transeundo in corpus Filii ejus; ut nobis corpus & sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii tui, Domini nostri Jesu Christi, i. e. ad nostram

*ble Sanctification of the Spirit.* Remigius of Auxerre has almost the same Words in his Treatise of the Celebration of the Mass in the same Tom. VI. Bibl. M. Patr. col. 451. and for a farther Explication adds, that the Priest prays, that God would vouchsafe to make the holy Oblation of Bread and Wine *blest*, i. e. that thou would'st vouchsafe to bless it; *approved*, i. e. that thou would'st look upon it as worthy to be changed into the Body of thy Son; *reasonable*, the Bread and Wine are in themselves mere Matter, but the Priest prays, that by his reasonable Service, and the Consecration of Almighty God, they may be made reasonable, (or receive a rational or divine Energy) by passing into the Body of his Son; that it may become the Body and Blood of thy most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that is, that it may become



*stram Salutem fiat corpus ejus & sanguis. Ad-*  
*huc Sec. XII. Odo Episcopus Cameracensis*  
*in Sacri Canonis Expositione citato Tom. VI.*  
*Bibl. M. Patr. col. 319. recitatum supra ora-*  
*tionem explicaturus, Hæc tertia, inquit, perio-*  
*duſ, quam ingredimur, maxime occupatur circa*  
*Sacrificium, ut fiat perfectum, & in aliam mute-*  
*tur substantiam, immortalem & incorruptam.*  
*Et col. 360. Quando igitur oramus hostiam fie-*  
*ri adscriptam, quid aliud optamus, nisi ut quæ*  
*adhuc est panis corruptibilis, fiat substantia in-*  
*corrupta.—Fac ergo, Domine, nostram oblationem*  
*adscriptam, ut pretiosum Christi corpus fiat, ver-*  
*bo Dei adunata, & in unitate personæ conjuncta.*  
*Deinde deveniens ad verba, Ut nobis corpus &*  
*sanguis fiat dilectissimi filii tui, ita commentatur,*  
*Hic*

*come his Body and Blood to our Salvation. In the*  
*twelfth Century also, Odo Bishop of Cambray*  
*in his Exposition of the Sacred Canon, published in*  
*the aforesaid Tom. VI. Bibl. M. Patr. col. 319.*  
*explaining the above cited Prayer, says, This third*  
*Period, which we are upon, chiefly relates to the Sacri-*  
*fice, that it may be made perfect, and be changed into ano-*  
*ther Substance, immortal and uncorrupted. And col. 360.*  
*When therefore we pray, that the Sacrifice may be made*  
*approved, what else do we desire, but that the Bread,*  
*which as yet is corruptible, may be made an uncorrupted*  
*Substance? — Make, therefore, O Lord, our Oblati-*  
*on approved, that it may become the precious Body of*  
*Christ, united and join'd to the Word of God in unity*  
*of Person. Then proceeding to the Words, that it*  
*may be made to us the Body and Blood of thy most be-*  
*loved Son, he writes thus, Here the whole is finish'd,*  
*F the*

Hic totum completur, totum perficitur, ut fiat corpus & sanguis Christi tantum. Solum Christi corpus & sanguis est hostia in omnibus benedicta, adscripta, rata, rationabilis, acceptabilisq; Ut nobis corpus & sanguis fiat; signanter posuit nobis, i. e. Catholicæ fidei cultoribus. Et Stephanus Aeduenensis lib. de Sacramento Altaris cap. 13. col. 389. laudatam orationem exponens ait. Oramus, ut cibus hominum fiat cibus Angelorum, Scilicet ut oblatio panis & vini transubstantietur in corpus & sanguinem Jesu Christi. Quid multis? Iple Bellarminus, quasi sui immemor, lib. 2. de Missâ cap. 23. sequentem ejus sensum esse docet, Non oramus, ait, pro Eucharistiâ consecratâ, sed pro pane & vino consecrando: Neq; petimus, ut Deus benedicat

*the whole is perfected, that it may only become the Body and Blood of Christ. The Body of Christ alone and his Blood is the Sacrifice in every respect, blessed, approved, confirmed, reasonable, and acceptable. That it may be made the Body and Blood to us; It is emphatically written to us, that is, the Professors of the Catholick Faith. And Stephanus Aeduenensis in his Book of the Sacrament of the Altar, cap. 13. col. 389. expounding the Prayer before us, says, We pray that the Food of Men may be made the Food of Angels, namely that the Oblation of Bread and Wine may be transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. In short, Bellarmin himself, as if he had forgot his former Argument, gives his Opinion in the following Words, Book 2. concerning the Mass. chap. 23. We pray not, says he, for the consecrated Eucharist, but for the Bread and Wine that is to be consecrated: nor*  
do

dicat & sanctificet corpus & sanguinem Christi, sed ut benedicat & sanctificet panem & vinum, ut per eam benedictionem & sanctificationem fiat corpus & sanguis Domini. Utrumq; igitur hâc petitione rogatur; nimirum 1<sup>o</sup> ut panis & vinum per Spiritum Sanctum mutantur & transeant in corpus & sanguinem Domini, sicq; perfectum fiant sacrificium: 2<sup>o</sup> ut hoc in usum & salutem fidelium cedat. Unde Bellarminus loco prius citato posterius solum ibi flagitari falso docet. Imo in primâ Canonis oratione, *Te igitur, Clementissime Pater, per Jesum Christum Filium tuum, Dominum nostrum, supplices rogamus, ut accepta habeas, & benedicas hæc dona, hæc munera, hæc sancta sacrificia illibata, dum benedici panem & vinum postulat*

*do we desire God to bless and sanctify the Body and Blood of Christ, but to bless and sanctify the Bread and Wine, that by that Benediction and Sanctification it may be made the Body and Blood of the Lord. In this Petition then we ask, both that the Bread and Wine may be changed by the holy Spirit, and pass into the Body and Blood of the Lord, and so be made a perfect Sacrifice, and also that it may be for the Use and Salvation of the Faithful. So that Bellarmin is in the wrong, when in the Place first cited he says the latter only is petition'd for. Nay in the first Prayer of the Canon, We therefore, most merciful Father, humbly beseech thee through Jesus Christ thy Son our Lord, to accept and bless these Gifts, these Offerings, these holy unspotted Sacrifices, when the Priest calls for a Blessing upon the Bread and Wine, he petitions for the very Consecration of those*



stulat Sacerdos, ipsam horum symbolorum consecrationem rogat, ut iterum laudati Commentatores nos docent. Quippe Florus, col. 168. A. *Petimus, inquit, ut hæc Spiritu tuo sanctifices, atq; ore benedicas, ut quod nostræ humilitatis geritur ministerio, tuæ virtutis impleatur effectu.* Eadem planè habet Remigius An-  
tissiodorensis col. 449. B. *Clarius Odo Cameracensis col. 315. Seq. τὸ benedicas in laudatâ oratione his adjunctis explicat verbis, multiplicando gratiam, augendo dignitatem, imo CONVERTENDO in excellentissimam immortalitatis & incorruptionis creaturam.* Omnium disertissime Stephanus Aeduen-  
sis col. 379. B. *istud benedicas ita παρὰ τοῦ στόματος, ut tuâ benedictione facias CONVERTI in illud corpus Filii tui,*  
quod

Symbols, as we also learn from the above mention'd Commentators. Thus Florus col. 168. A. *We desire thee, says he, to sanctify these Creatures with thy Spirit, and bless them with thy Mouth, that what is done by our weak Ministry, may be filled with the Virtue of thy Power.* Remigius of Auxerre delivers himself in the same manner, col. 449. B. Odo of Cambray more fully explains the Word *bless* in the Prayer before us, col. 315. Seq. *by multiplying Grace upon them, increasing their Dignity, nay by Turning them into the most excellent Immortal and incorruptible Creature.* Stephanus Aeduen-  
sis col. 379. B. is of all the most express, when he thus paraphrases the Word *bless*, *that by thy Benediction thou would'st cause them to be converted into that Body of thy Son, which hung upon the Cross, which was glorified in the Resurrection, and deified in the Ascension.* To  
con-

quod pependit in cruce, quod glorificatum est in resurrectione, quod deificatum est in ascensione. Deniq; ipse Bellarminus lib. 2. de Missâ cap. 21. respondens ad secundam objectionem Lutheri contra hanc communionem de Sacris Symbolis, ait, *quanquam sancta sint, tamen sanctiora fieri debent per MUTATIONEM in corpus & sanguinem Christi, & ideo rectè petimus, ut Deus illis benedicat, eaq; sanctificet, nimirum ut sic fiant corpus & sanguis Christi.* Ex quibus patet Romanam Missam cum laudatis ante Liturgiis optime consonare in eo, quod in utrisq; consecratio panis & vini sacrâ prece à Deo postuletur, quanquam ratione ordinis sit differentia, siquidem in Jacobi, Marci, Clementis, Gregorii, Basilii, Chrysostomi, Cyrilli deniq; Liturgiis primò instar fundamenti po-

conclude, Bellarmin himself, Book 2. concerning the Mass, chap. 21. in his Answer to Luther's second Objection against this Communion-Office, says, *though they be holy, yet shou'd they be made more so by being changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, and therefore we rightly petition God to bless and sanctify them, namely, that by this Means they may become the Body and Blood of Christ.* From whence it is evident, that there is a perfect Agreement between the Romish Missal and the Liturgies above cited in this respect, that both of them call upon God by holy Prayer for the Consecration of the Bread and Wine, though they differ in the Situation of that Prayer, for in the Liturgies of James, Mark, Clement, Gregory, Basil, Chrysostom, and Cyril, the Words of our Lord are placed first as the Foundation,

ponuntur verba Domini, deinde sequitur iis innixa oratio, quâ Deus rogatur, ut demisso spiritu sancto panem & vinum in corpus & sanguinem Christi transmutet; in Missâ autem Romanæ Ecclesiæ similes istis preces consecratoriae præmittuntur, ut quando verba Christi, *Hoc est corpus meum, Hic est sanguis meus*, pronuntiata fuerint, tunc statim ex pane corpus Christi, & ex vino sanguis Domini fiat. Tertia Bellarmini ratio, a testimonio Græcorum in Concilio Florentino petita, quantum valeat, ex iis, quæ supra de Actis Concilii Florentini hâc in causâ dixi, facile colligi potest. Inscius quippe ac dissentientibus pluribus, Bessarion cum uno atq; altero Latinorum Sententiam amplexus est, ac pro eâ sermonem habuit.

Sed

dation, and then follows the Prayer that is founded upon them, in which God is intreated to send down his holy Spirit, and to change the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ; but in the Mass of the Romish Church the consecrating Prayers, which answer to this, are placed first, that upon pronouncing the Words of Christ, *This is my Body, This is my Blood*, the Bread may immediately be made the Body of Christ, and the Wine the Blood of the Lord. What Force there is in Bellarmin's third Reason, which is taken from the Testimony of the Greeks in the Council of Florence, any one may judge from what I have before observed in this Dispute concerning the Acts of that Council. For Bessarion with one or two more embraced the Opinion of the Latins, without the Knowledge and Consent of most of the Greeks, and made a Speech in Defence of it.

But



Sed tota Ecclesia Orientalis interim in eâ per-  
stitit sententiâ, quam à S. Patribus traditam ac-  
cepit, videlicet, non solâ verborum Christi  
recitatione, sed & adjunctis precibus Eucharis-  
tiam consecrari.

Quanquam igitur recitati ante S. Liturgiarum  
textus, & ab exceptionibus Latinorum hæte-  
nus vindicati, abunde dictam Græcorum sen-  
tentiam confirment, tamen ut consensus Ca-  
tholicæ Ecclesiæ eò liquidior appareat, testi-  
monia singulorum S. Patrum per omnia secula  
legitimo ordine subjungam.

Secul.

But the whole Eastern Church still kept close to  
the Opinion, which they had received by Tradi-  
tion from the holy Fathers, namely, that the Eu-  
charist is not consecrated by the mere recital of  
Christ's Words, but also by additional Prayers.

Therefore, notwithstanding the Passages above  
cited from the sacred Liturgies, and thus far vin-  
dicated from the Exceptions of the Latins, may  
be sufficient to confirm the Opinion of the Greeks,  
yet that the Consent of the Catholick Church may  
more fully appear, I shall in a regular Order sub-  
join the Testimonies of the particular Fathers in  
all Ages.

Century

2. S.S. Patrum Doctorumq; Probatorum pro sententiâ Græcorum contra Ecclesiæ Romanæ definitionem testimonia.

Justin Martyris.

*moniam, unde sanguis & caro nostra per mutationem aluntur, incarnati illius Jesu carnem & Sanguinem esse edocti sumus. Equidem Bellarm. lib. IV. de Eucharistiâ cap. 13. hunc locum citans ait, Justinum mox seipsum exponere, & addere, quod per has preces intelligat verba Christi, Hoc est corpus meum, Hic est sanguis meus. Sed fallum est, Justinum Martyrem ista addidisse, quæ ipsi tribuit. Equidem*

Secul. 2. Justinus Martyr Apol. 2. pro Christianis pag.

98. ait, τὴν δὲ εὐχῆς λόγος τὸ παρ' αὐτῆς εὐχαριστοῦν δάσαντες τὸ φησὶν *Eam, quæ per preces verbi (Christi) ab ipso (Deo) pro-*

*fecti, Eucharisticam factam ali-*

2. Testimonies of Holy Fathers and approved Doctors for the Opinion of the Greeks against the Determination of the Romish Church.

Justin Martyr.

*Substance, is the Flesh and Blood of that incarnate Jesus. Bellarm. indeed, Book IV. concerning the Eucharist, chap. 13. citing this Passage says, that Justin afterwards explains himself, and adds, that by these Prayers he meant the Words of Christ, This is my Body, This is my Blood. But it is not true that Justin Martyr added those Words, which*

Century the Second. Justin Martyr in his second Apology for the Christians, pag. 98. has these Words. *We are taught that the Food, which is made the Eucharist by the Prayers of the Word (of Christ) that comes from him (God) by which Food our Flesh and Blood are nourished by its passing into our*

he

dem citat, fateor, Justinus Martyr mox historiam institutionis Christi ex Evangeliiis, eo fine, ut ex iis probet, panem & vinum Eucharisticum esse corpus & sanguinem Domini: at, quod verba Christi, *Hoc est corpus meum*, sint istæ preces, per quas Sacra Symbola consecrantur, non dicit, neq; dicere potuit. Preces enim Deum compellant, adq; ipsum directè referuntur; quis verò hoc de istis Christi verbis, *Hoc est corpus meum*, affirmaverit?

Eodem seculo Irenæus, & Irenæi.  
per recitationem verbi divini  
& per orationem panem & vinum consecrari clarissime docet. Et de verbo quidem, lib. 5. adv. Hæreses cap. 2. *Quando, inquit, mixtus calice*

he ascribes to him. I confess Justin Martyr does afterwards cite the History of Christ's Institution out of the Gospels, to prove from them, that the Eucharistical Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of the Lord; but that the Words of Christ, *This is my Body*, are those Prayers, by which the sacred Symbols are consecrated, he neither does, nor cou'd say. For Prayers are address'd to God, and directly referr'd to him, but who can affirm this of those Words of Christ, *This is my Body*?

In the same Century Irenæus plainly teaches, that the Bread Irenæus.  
and Wine are consecrated both  
by the recital of the divine Word, and by Prayer: By the Word, Book V. against Heresies, chap. 2. *When, says he, the mix'd Cup and sacrificial*  
G Bread



calix & factus panis percipit verbum Dei, fit Eucharistia corporis & sanguinis Domini. Similiter autem de precibus lib. 4. cap. 34. Qui est à terrâ panis percipiens invocationem Dei, jam non communis panis est, sed Eucharistia.

Origenis.

Origenes in cap. XV. Matthæi, Tom. 2. pag. 17. col. 1. identidem de consecratione panis Eucharistici dicit, quod Apostolus 1 Tim. iv. de quâvis ait in genere; *Sanctificatur per verbum Dei & per obsecrationem.* Et lib. 8. contra Celsum, p. 399. disertissime scribit, *Nos, qui rerum omnium conditori placere studemus, cum precibus & gratiarum actione pro beneficiis acceptis edimus oblatos panes per precationem factos sanctum quod-*

*Bread perceive the Word of God, they are made the Eucharist of the Body and Blood of the Lord. By Prayer, Book 4. chap. 34. The Bread, which is the Product of the Earth, perceiving the Invocation of God, is no longer common Bread, but the Eucharist.*

Origen.

Origen in chap. xv. Matth. Tom. 2. pag. 17. col. 1. often speaks of the Consecration of the Eucharistical Bread in the same Terms which the Apostle uses of Consecration in general; 1 Tim. iv. *It is sanctified by the Word of God and by Prayer.* And Book 8. against Celsus p. 399. he writes most expressly, *We, that study to please the Creator of all things, do with Prayer and Thanksgiving for the Mercies we have received, eat the sacrificial Bread, which is by Prayer made a holy Body, sanctifying those that make*

quoddam corpus σῶμα γενομένης διὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἁγίον τι, & sanctificans utentes eo cum bono proposito. Cui ultimo dicto Origenis eò magis fidendum est, quòd, uti Dallæus de Poenis & satisfactionibus humanis, pag. 618. non ineptè observat, ea Origenis opera, è quibus alia afferuntur, Latine tantum exstent, & quidem multipliciter interpolata; opus verò contra Celsum, è quo hæc desumpta sunt, & Græcè habeamus, ut est ab Autore conscriptum, & sincerum ac incorruptum.

Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus  
Catech. Mystag. 1. p. 229. C. Cyrilli Hierosolymitani.  
Panis, inquit, & vinum Eucharistiæ ante sacram invocationem adorandæ Trinitatis, panis erat & vinum merum; Peractâ  
verò

a righteous use of it. Which last Passage of Origen's is the more to be depended upon, because, as Daillee rightly observes in his Piece of human Punishments and Satisfactions, pag. 618. Those Works of Origen, from which other Testimonies are produced, are extant only in Latin, and that miserably interpolated; but his Piece against Celsus, from whence this Passage is transcribed, we have in Greek, as it was written by the Author, pure and uncorrupted.

The Eucharistical Bread and Wine, says Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Jerusalem.  
Mystagogical Catechism 1. p. 229.  
C. before the sacred invocation of the adorable Trinity, was mere Bread and Wine; but upon repeating the Invocation, the Bread is made the Body of  
G 2 Christ,

verò invocatione, ἐπιλήσεως δ'ε γενομένης, panis quidem fit corpus Christi, vinum autem sanguis Christi. Et Catech. Mystagog. p. 235. A. Panis Eucharistiae post invocationem S. Spiritus, μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, non amplius est panis communis, sed est corpus Christi. Respicit aptè ad istam, quam è plurimis Liturgiis ante allegavimus, orationem, quamq; ipsâ etiam Catech. 5. pag. 241. B. recitat, ita scribens; Deum benignissimum oramus, ut super illa proposita S. Spiritum emittat, ut panem quidem faciat corpus Christi, vinum verò sanguinem Christi, Sicq; docet confici spirituale sacrificium, ἀπαριθμῶν τὴν πνευματικὴν οὐσίαν.

Ephr. Syri.

Similiter Ephrem Syrus in Orat. de sacerdotio, Tom. 1. pag. 20. col. 1. Sacer-

Christ, and the Wine the Blood of Christ. And Catech. Mystagog. p. 235. A. The Eucharistical Bread after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no longer common Bread but the Body of Christ. He plainly alludes to the Prayer, which we have before produced from a great Number of Liturgies, and which himself also Catech. 5. pag. 241. B. cites in these Words, We petition the most bountiful God, to send down the holy Spirit upon the Gifts that lay before him, that he may make the Bread the Body of Christ, and the Wine the Blood of Christ, and thus he says, it is made a spiritual Sacrifice.

Ephr. Syrus.

So Ephrem Syrus in his Oration concerning the Priesthood, Tom. 1. pag. 20. col. 1. The Priesthood, says he, searing boldly from Earth to Heaven,



*Sacerdotium, inquit, audacter à terrâ sursum in  
caelum volitans, ascendit ad Deum, misericordi-  
am & indulgentiam a Rege misericorde postulans,  
ut Spiritus Sanctus pariter descendat, sanctificetq;  
dona in terris proposita, panem scilicet & vinum.*

Hanc ἐπίκλησιν Basilus M. Basilii Magni.  
lib. de Spir. Sancto cap. 27.

Tom. 2. pag. 351. inter traditiones Aposto-  
licas non scriptas refert, dum ait; *Invocationis  
verba, quum conficitur panis Eucharistiae & pocu-  
lum benedictionis, quis Sanctorum in scripto nobis  
reliquit? Ast illa Christi verba, Hoc est corpus  
meum, quibus solis consecrationem Romana  
Ecclesia adscribit, sunt a Sanctis Evangelistis  
scripta; neq; sunt invocationis, sed indicativæ  
enuntiationis verba. Hæc igitur Basilus non  
intelli-*

*ven, ascends up to God, asking Mercy and Indulgence  
from the King of Mercies, and that the holy Spirit may  
descend and sanctify the Gifts offer'd up on Earth,  
namely the Bread and Wine.*

This Invocation, Basil the  
great, in his Book concerning the Basil the great.  
Holy Spirit, chap. 27: Tom. 2.

pag. 351. reckons among the unwritten Apostolical  
Traditions, when he says, *Which of the Saints has  
left us in writing the Words of Invocation at the conse-  
crating the Eucharistical Bread and Cup of Blessing?*  
But those Words of Christ, *This is my Body*, to  
which alone the Church of Rome ascribes the Con-  
secration, are written by the Evangelists, and are  
not invocatory but declarative. Basil then does  
not

intelligit, sed illa, quæ supra diximus, atq; iis consecrationem adscribit.

Gregorii Nysseni.

Nec à S. Basilii mente alienus fuit ejus frater germanus, Gregorius Nyssenus in Orat. Catechet. magnâ Cap. 37. Tom. 3. p. 104. C. D. hæc habens verba, *Hic ( in Eucharistiâ ) similiter panis, sicut dicit Apostolus, sanctificatur per verbum Dei & orationem, non ita quidem, ut mediante esu & potu transeat in corpus verbi, sed quod statim ( simulac consecratio accesserit ) in corpus verbi transmutetur, sicuti dictum est a verbo, Hoc est corpus meum. Et in fine hujus capituli docet, quod τῇ τῆς εὐλογίας δυνάμει, virtute benedictionis transelementetur sacrorum symbolorum natura.*

Sic

not mean them, but those we have before spoken of, and to those he attributes the Consecration.

And of the same Opinion is Gregory Nyssen. S. Basil's own Brother Gregory Nyssen, who in his great Catechetical Oration, chap. 37. Tom. 3. p. 104. C. D. has these Words, *So here ( in the Eucharist ) the Bread according to the Saying of the Apostle, is sanctified by the Word of God and Prayer, not that it passes into the Body of the Word after it is eaten and drunk, but it is immediately (after Consecration) changed into the Body of the Word, for he said, This is my Body. And in the End of this Chapter he teaches, that by the Power of the Blessing the Nature of the holy Symbols is changed. Gregory then directly refers* the

Sic Gregorius & Verbo, & orationi sive benedictioni τῇ ἐνέυξει atq; εὐλογία consecrationem directè tribuit, quam Latini solâ Verbi enunciatione perfici asserunt.

Non minus S. Ambrosius, S. Ambrosii.  
ut aliis in punctis, ita & hâc  
in causâ cum S. Basilio amicè conspirat, dum  
Lib. IV. de fide ad Gratianum Imperatorem,  
cap. 5. Tom. IV. col. 174. C. scribit, *Nos,*  
*quotiescunq; sacramenta sumimus, quæ per sa-*  
*crae orationis mysterium in carnem transfigurantur*  
*& sanguinem, mortem Domini annuntiamus.* Si  
orationes præparantes ad Missam certò essent S.  
Ambrosii, earum primam in rem meam citare  
possem, siquidem in eâ Sacerdos inter alia ita  
orat, Tom. 5. col. 337. *Peto, Domine, Cle-*  
*mentiam*

the Consecration, which the Latins assert to be  
perfected by merely repeating the Word, both to the  
Word and to Prayer or Blessing.

The same Agreement we find  
between S. Ambrose and S. Basil, S. Ambrose.  
as in other Points, so also in this  
Dispute, for says he, Book IV. concerning Faith,  
written to Gratian the Emperor, chap. V. Tom.  
IV. col. 174. C. *As often as we take the Sacrament,*  
*which is transfigured into Flesh and Blood by the Mystery*  
*of holy Prayer, we shew forth the Lord's Death.* If  
those preparatory Prayers before the Mass, were  
certainly S. Ambrose's, the first of them would be  
to my Purpose, for there the Priest among other  
things prays, Tom. V. col. 337. *I beseech thy Cle-*  
*mency*



mentiam tuam, ut descendat super hunc panem & calicem istum plenitudo Divinitatis tuæ. Descendat etiam, Domine, illa S. Spiritus tui invisi- bilis forma, & incomprehensibilis Majestas, sicuti quondam in Patrum hostias descendebat, qui & oblationes nostras corpus & sanguinem Tuum efficiat. Sed, cum dubium sit, utrum istæ orationes verè sint Ambrosii, transeat hoc testimonium, cum ex alio loco certissimo clarè perspiciatur mens Ambrosii; Per talem nimirum sacram orationem, panem & vinum in carnem & sanguinem Domini transfigurari, quod est, plenissimè consecrari.

Optati.

Optatus Milevitanus quoq; quando Lib. VI. contra Parmenianum Donatistam,

mency, O Lord, that the Fulness of thy Divinity may descend upon this Bread and this Cup. Let the Form also and incomprehensible Majesty of thy holy Spirit descend, as it formerly descended upon the Sacrifices of the Fathers, and let it make our Oblations thy Body and Blood. But since it is dubious, whether those Prayers are really S. Ambrose's or not, I shall make no use of this Testimony, since we have a clear Proof of his Opinion from another undoubted Passage, namely, that by such holy Prayer the Bread and Wine are transfigur'd into the Body and Blood of the Lord, which is as much as to say, they are completely consecrated by it.

Optatus.

Optatus Milevitanus also, when in Book VI. against Parmenian the Donatist, speaking of Altars, he says, where God Almighty is invoked and the holy Spi-

tistam, factâ altarium mentione, ait, *Quo Deus Omnipotens invocatus sit, quo postulatus descendit Spiritus Sanctus*, haud obscure alludit ad orationem Sacerdotis, quâ Spiritum Sanctum a Deo demitti postulat, ut panem & vinum sanctificet, & transmutet in corpus & sanguinem Domini.

Clariora in rem nostram sunt verba Theophili Alexandrini, Epist. 1. Paschali, Tom.

Theoph. Alexandrini.

3. Bibl. M. Patr. disertè scribentis, *panem Dominicum & sacrum calicem per invocationem & adventum Spiritus Sancti consecrari.*

S. Jo-

*Spirit being call'd for descends*, plainly alludes to that Prayer of the Priest, in which God is desired to send down the holy Spirit, to sanctify the Bread and Wine and change them into the Body and Blood of the Lord.

Theoph. Alexandrinus's Words are yet fuller to our Purpose, Paschal Epistle 1. Tom. 3. Bibl. M. Patr. For he expressly writes that *the Bread of the Lord and the holy Cup are consecrated by the invocation and approach of the holy Spirit.*

Theoph. Alexandrinus.

H

S. John

S. Johannes Chryso-  
stomi. S. Johannes Chrysostomus  
Serm. XXXII. de Coemeterii  
appellatione, in fine Tom. 5.  
*Quid facis, O homo, inquit, quando sacerdos  
stat ante sacram mensam, manus in cælum ex-  
tendens, invocans Spiritum Sanctum, ut adve-  
niat & proposita tangat. Respicit ad orationem  
supra ex ejus Liturgiâ allegatam.*

S. Hieronymi. S. Hieronymus in Epist.  
LXXXV. ad Evagrium de Pres-  
byterio scribit, *Ad quorum preces Christi corpus  
sanguisq; conficitur. Idem in Sophoniæ, cap.  
3. commentans pravis de sacerdotibus, Pu-  
tant, inquit, Eucharistiam imprecantis facere  
verba,*

S. John Chryso-  
stom. S. John Chrysostom, Serm.  
XXXII. de Cæmeterii appellati-  
one in fine Tom. 5. has these  
Words, *What dost thou O Man,  
when the Priest stands before the holy Table, lifting up  
his Hands to Heaven, calling upon the holy Spirit to  
come and touch the Oblation? He alludes to the Pray-  
er before cited out of his Liturgy.*

S. Jerom. S. Jerom in Epist. LXXXV.  
to Evagrius, writing upon the  
Priesthood, says, *at whose Prayers  
the Body and Blood of Christ is consecrated. And  
upon Zephaniah chap. iii. speaking of wicked  
Priests, They judge, says he, that the Eucharist is  
made by the Words of the Minister, not by his Life;  
and*



*verba, non vitam; & necessariam esse tantum  
solemnem orationem, & non sacerdotum merita.  
Dum ita loquitur, evidentissimè supponit so-  
lenni oratione confici Eucharistiam.*

S. Augustinus Epist. LIX.

S. Augustini.

ad Paulinum explicans verba

Apostoli 1 Tim. ii. *Obsecro igitur primum om-  
nium fieri petitiones, orationes, postulationes, &c.  
his mentem suam exponit verbis, Precationes  
accipimus dictas, quas facimus in celebratione  
sacramentorum, antequam illud, quod est in men-  
sa Domini, incipiat benedici; Orationes, cum  
benedicitur & sanctificatur, & ad distribuendum  
comminuitur. Magis adhuc sententiam no-  
stram confirmat dictum ejus, Lib. 3. de Tri-  
nitate,*

*and that solemn Prayer only is necessary to that Purpose,  
not the Merit of the Priests. This Language evident-  
ly supposes, that the Eucharist is consecrated by  
solemn Prayer.*

S. Augustin Epist. LIX. to Pau-  
linus explaining the Words of the

S. Augustin.

Apostle, 1 Tim. 2. *I exhort there-  
fore that first of all Supplications, Prayers, Intercessi-  
ons, &c. be made, thus delivers his Opinion, By  
Supplications we understand those Petitions, which are  
made in the Sacramental Celebration, before that which  
is upon the Table of the Lord begins to be blessed; By  
Prayers, that Part of the Service, wherein it is blessed,  
and sanctified, and broken for distribution. But what  
he says, Book III. concerning the Trinity, chap.  
4. will yet add farther Strength to our Opinion.*

nitate, cap. 4. *Corpus Christi & sanguinem dicimus illud tantum, quod ex fructibus terræ acceptum & prece mysticâ consecratum ritè sumimus ad salutem in memoriam Dominicæ pro nobis passionis. Idem refutans Donatistas Sacramenta à peccatoribus consecrata atq; ministrata haud valida esse contendentes, lib. 5. de Baptismo contra Donatistas, c. 20. Quomodo ergo, inquit, exaudit Deus homicidam deprecantem vel super aquam Baptismi, vel super oleum, vel super Eucharistiam? Ubi manifestè loquitur de signorum sacramentalium consecratione.*

Theodoret.

Sæc. V. floruit Theodoretus, in cuius dialogo II. qui dicitur *Inconfusus*, Tom. IV. p. 84. quærit Eranistes, *Qui*

*We call that only the Body and Blood of Christ, which being taken from the Product of the Earth and consecrated by mystical Prayer, we duly receive to our Salvation, in Memory of what the Lord suffer'd for us. Again in his Confutation of the Donatist Opinion, that the Sacramental Consecrations and Administrations of Sinners were invalid, Book V. concerning Baptism against the Donatists, c. 20. He says, How then does God hear the Prayers of the Murderer, which he makes over the Baptismal Water, over the Oyl, or over the Eucharist? Where he plainly speaks of the Consecration of the Sacramental Signs.*

Theodoret.

In the fifth Century flourished Theodoret, in whose second Dialogue which is called *Inconfusus*, Tom. IV. p. 84. Eranistes asks, *How do you call the Obla-*

*Qui appellas donum, quod offertur ante sacer-*  
*dotis invocationem* τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐπικλησεως?  
 Respondet Orthodoxus, p. 85. *cibum ex tali-*  
*bus seminibus, panem indigitans. Pergit Era-*  
*nistes, Post sanctificationem verò,* μετὰ δέ γε  
 τὸν ἁγιασμὸν *quomodo appellas?* Ad quod re-  
 gerit Orthodoxus, *Corpus Christi & sanguinem*  
*Christi.* In quo dialogismo apertissime sacer-  
 dotis precatio cum sanctificatione seu conse-  
 cratione permutatur, hancq; illâ fieri innuitur.  
 Id quod clarissimis verbis ibidem docetur, qu.  
 Eranistes mox pergit, dicens, *symbola & Do-*  
*minici corporis & sanguinis alia sunt ante sacer-*  
*dotis invocationem, post invocationem verò mu-*  
*tantur, & alia fiunt,* μετὰ δέ γε τὴν ἐπίκλησιν  
 μεταβάλλεται καὶ ἕτερον γίνεσθαι.

Ad

*Oblation before the Invocation of the Priest?* Ortho-  
 doxus answers, p. 85. *Food made of such and such*  
*Seeds, meaning Bread.* Eranistes proceeds, *And*  
*how do you call it after the Sanctification?* To which  
 Orthodoxus replies, *The Body of Christ and the Blood*  
*of Christ.* Now in this Dialogue the Prayer of the  
 Priest and the Sanctification are plainly used for  
 one another, and the latter is intimated to be the  
 Consequence of the former. Which is afterwards  
 declared in exprefs Terms, where Eranistes pro-  
 ceeds and says, *The Symbols of the Lord's Body and*  
*Blood are one thing before the Invocation of the Priest,*  
*and are changed to another after it.*

In



S. Nil.

Ad eundem prorsus modum scripsit S. Nilus in Epistolâ ad Philippum Scholasticum, cujus sequentia sunt verba citata a Leone Allatio in disputatione de Missâ Præsanctificatorum, num. 18. *Eodem modo divina nostra mysteria comprehendere; ante sacerdotis verba & Spiritûs Sancti descensum nudum panem & vinum commune, quæ proponuntur, existere; at post tremendas illas invocationes ἐπικλήσεις & adorandi & vivifici & boni spiritûs adventum haud esse nudum panem & commune vinum, quæ apposita sunt in sacro altari, sed corpus & sanguinem pretiosum & immaculatum Christi, universorum Dei.*

Eodem

S. Nilus.

In the same Manner writes S. Nilus in his Epistle to Philip the Lawyer, from whom the following Words are cited by Leo Allatius in his Dispute concerning the Missa Præsanctificatorum num. 18. *In the same Manner you are to conceive of our divine Mysteries; that before the Words of the Priest and the descent of the holy Spirit the Oblation is mere Bread and common Wine; but after those tremendous Invocations, and the approach of the adorable, life-giving, and good Spirit, the Elements that lye upon the Altar are no longer mere Bread and common Wine, but the precious and immaculate Body and Blood of Christ, the God of the Universe.*

In

Eodem ævo Proclus Patriarcha Constantinopolitanus in Fragmento Liturgiæ de Apostolis ac eorum successoribus super pane & vino precantibus loquitur, *Per preces has, inquit, Spiritus Sancti adventum expectabant, qui divinâ præsentia suâ propositum panem & vinum aquâ mixtum faceret & consecraret illud ipsum corpus & sanguinem Jesu Christi Salvatoris nostri.*

Procli.

Sec. VI. Cæsarius Arelaten- Cæsarii Arelatensis.  
sis Hom. VII. de Pascha Tom.

2. Bibl. M. Patr. col. 280. D. ita loquitur,  
*Quando benedicendæ verbis cælestibus creaturæ  
sacris altaribus imponuntur, antequam invocatio-  
ne*

In the same Century Proclus Patriarch of Constantinople in his Liturgical Fragment speaking of the Apostles and their Successors praying over the Bread and Wine, says, *Through these Prayers they expected the coming of the Holy Spirit, that by his divine Presence the sacrificial Bread and Wine mix'd with Water might be made and consecrated the very Body and Blood of Jesus Christ our Saviour.*

Proclus.

In the sixth Century Cæsarius of Arles, Hom. VII. concerning Easter, Tom. II. Bibl. M. Patr. col. 280. D. delivers himself thus, *When the Creatures that are to be blessed with the cælestial Words are placed upon the Altar, before they are consecrated by the invocation of the sacred Name, they are merely the Sub-  
stance*

Cæsarius of Arles.

*ne Sancti nominis consecrentur, substantia illic est panis & vini; Post verba autem Christi, corpus & sanguis Christi. Et verbis Christi & precatiori consecrationem tribuit, atq; post illorum pronuntiationem corpus Christi adesse dicit, usus proculdubio Romano Missæ ordine, juxta quem oratio præcedit verborum Christi recitationem, adeo ut si hæc illi accesserit, plena jam facta sit consecratio.*

Gregorii Magni.

Porro Gregorius M. lib. VII. Epist. 64. dum scribit Apostolorum morem fuisse, *ut ad ipsam solummodo orationem Dominicam oblationis hostiam consecrarent, & ipse consecrationem orationi haud obscure tribuit.*

Clarius

*stance of Bread and Wine; but after the Words of Christ, they are the Body and Blood of Christ. He ascribes the Consecration both to the Words of Christ and to Prayer, and affirms the Body of Christ to be present upon their being pronounced, which doubtless is owing to his using the Roman Order of the Mass, according to which the Prayer of Invocation is put before the recital of Christ's Words, so that by adding this recital to that Prayer the Consecration is perfected.*

Gregory the Great. VII. Epistle 64. when he says that the Apostles used to consecrate the *sacrisficial Oblation by the Lord's Prayer only*, does not obscurely attribute the Consecration to Prayer.

Hely-



Clarius id ipsum docet Hesychius, L. 2. in Levit. Fol. 49.

Hesychii.

D. ita scribens, *Nisi Christus rogatus ore sacerdotum ipse venerit, & cœnam sanctificaverit, & initiaverit ea quæ aguntur, nullatenus sacrificium Dominicum fiunt.*

Sec. VII. Isidorus Hispal. lib. VI. Originum cap. 18.

Isidori Hispalensis.

(al. 19.) pag. 52. de Eucharistiâ ait, *Sacrificium dictum, quasi sacrum factum, quia prece mysticâ consecratur in memoriam pro nobis dominicæ passionis: Unde hoc, eo iubente, corpus Christi & sanguinem dicimus, quod dum sit ex fructibus terræ, sanctificatur & fit sacramentum, operante*

Hesychius speaks more fully to the Purpose, B. 2. upon Levit. Fol. 49. D. writing in this Manner,

Hesychius.

*Unless Christ himself comes at the Request of the Priest, and sanctifies the Supper, and confirms what is done at the Altar, it is by no Means the Lord's Sacrifice.*

Century VII. Isidore of Sevil

in Book VI. of Originations, c.

Isidorus Hispalensis.

18. [al. 19.] pag. 52. speaks thus

of the Eucharist, *It is called a Sacrifice, quasi sacrum factum, because it is consecrated by mystical Prayer in Memory of our Lord's Passion for us: Therefore we call it, according to his Command, the Body and Blood of Christ, because, though it be the Product of the Earth, it is sanctified and made a Sa-*  
I  
trament

*rante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei.* Quæ verba desumpsit ex supra citato Augustini lib. 3. de Trinit. cap. 4. Idem Isidorus lib. 1. de officiis Ecclesiasticis cap. XV. pag. 394. *Ordo, inquit, Missæ vel Orationum, quibus oblata Deo sacrificia consecrantur primum a S. Petro est institutus:* Hunc Missæ ordinem in Seqq. perlustrans atq; singulas orationes exponens, ait; *Porro & hinc (oratio) sexta succedit, confirmatio sacramenti, ut oblatio, quæ Domino offertur, sanctificata per Spiritum Sanctum corpori Christi & sanguini conformetur.* Ubi rectè ultimum verbum legit Cassander Cap. 20. Liturg. pag. 41. pro quo in vulgatis Exemplaribus perperam extat, *confirmetur*, quòd sensu caret.

Sec.

*crament by the invisible Operation of the Spirit of God.* Which Words he borrowed from the above-cited Passage of St. Austin, Book III. concerning the Trinity, cap. 4. This same Isidore Book I. concerning Ecclesiastical Offices, cap. XV. pag. 394. says that *the Order of the Mass, or Prayers, by which the Sacrifices, that are offer'd to God, are consecrated, was first instituted by St. Peter.* Afterwards surveying this Order of the Mass and expounding the particular Prayers, he says; *And here follows a Sixth (Prayer) by which the Sacrament is perfected, that the Oblation, which is offer'd to God, being sanctified by the holy Spirit may be made like Christ's Body and Blood.* Where Cassander rightly reads *conformetur*, may be made like, cap. 20. Liturg. pag. 41. for which in the common Editions is erroneously written *confirmetur*, may be confirmed, which has no Meaning.

Century

Sec. VIII. Germanus Patriarcha Constantinopol. in Germani.  
Theoriâ Rerum Ecclesiasticarum actiones atq;  
orationes sacerdotis in celebratione Eucharisti-  
câ considerans, ita scribit, Tom. XII. Bibl.  
M. Patr. pag. 402. *Rursus obsecrat, ut confi-*  
*ciatur mysterium Filii ejus, & fiat, sive transmu-*  
*tetur ipse panis & vinum in corpus & sanguinem*  
*Christi & Dei.*

Johannes Damascenus, lib. Joh. Damasceni.  
IV. de Orthodoxâ fide, cap.  
14. pag. 317. *Sequentibus verbis suum nobis*  
*addit calculum, Propositionis panis vinumq; &*  
*aqua per invocationem & adventum Spiritus San-*  
*cti*

Century VIII. Germanus Pa-  
triarch of Constantinople in his Germanus.  
Ecclesiastical Theory examining  
the Actions and Prayers of the Priest in the Eu-  
charistical Celebration, writes thus, Tom. XII.  
Bibl. M. Patr. pag. 402. *Again he prays, that the*  
*Mystery of his Son may be finish'd, and that the Bread*  
*and Wine may be made or chang'd into the Body and*  
*Blood of Christ and God.*

John Damascen in his fourth  
Book of the orthodox Faith, cap. John Damascen.  
14. p. 317. gives us his Testi-  
mony in the following Words, *The sacrificial Bread*  
*Wine and Water are supernaturally changed into the Bo-*  
*dy*



*Eti supernaturaliter transmutantur in corpus & sanguinem Christi.*

Caroli Magni.

Sub finem Sec. VIII. Carolus Magnus, aut alius ejus jussu Scriptor Librorum de imaginibus, lib. 2. cap. 27. ab initio expresse asserit, quod corporis & sanguinis Dominici Sacramentum ad commemorationem suæ passionis & nostræ salutis nobis concessum ab eodem Mediatore Dei & hominum per manum sacerdotis & invocationem Divini numinis conficiatur. Et post medium idem repetit, nempe quod sacramentum Eucharistiæ efficiatur operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei, quodque consecretur a sacerdote Divini nominis invocatione.

Sec.

*dy and Blood of Christ by the invocation and descent of the holy Spirit.*

About the End of the eighth Century Charles the Great, or the Author of the Book concerning Images, written at his Command, Book 2. chap. 27. expressly asserts in the Beginning, that the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord, which is granted to us in Memory of his Passion and our Salvation by the same Mediator of God and Man, is consecrated by the Hand of the Priest, and the Invocation of the Deity. And after the middle of the Book he repeats the same thing, namely, that the Sacrament of the Eucharist, is made such by the invisible Operation of the Spirit of God, and that it is consecrated by the Priest by the Invocation of the divine Name.

Cen.

## Sec. IX. Florum Magistrum

&amp; Remigium Antissiodoren-

Rhabani Mauri, &  
aliorum.

sem ceu testes sententiam nostram confirmantes supra laudavi. Addo ex eodem seculo Rhabanum Maurum, qui lib. 1. de institutione Clericorum, Cap. 32. non modò verba S. Augustini & Isidori Hispal. quibus *sacrificium prece mysticâ consecrari* asserunt, sua fecit atq; repetiit, sed & ipse sequenti cap. 33. propriis id docere videtur verbis, ita sonantibus, *Sicut corpus Christi aromatibus unctum in sepulchro novo per officium condebatur, ita modò in Ecclesiâ mysticum corpus illius cum unguentis sacre Orationis conditum in sacris vasis ad percipiendum fidelibus per sacerdotum officium administratur adhuc.*

Sec.

Century IX. Master Florus

and Remigius of Auxerre I have

Rhabanus Maurus, and others.

before cited in Confirmation of our Opinion. I may add of the same Century, Rhabanus Maurus, who in his first Book of the Institution of the Clergy, cap. 32. not only appropriates and repeats the Words of S. Austin and Isidore of Sevil, which assert that *the Sacrifice is consecrated by mystical Prayer*, but also in the following Chapter delivers the same Doctrine in his own Words, which are these, *As the Body of Christ being anointed with Spices, was duly reposed in a new Sepulchre, so now in the Church his mystical Body being reposed in sacred Vessels with the Ointment of holy Prayer, is by the Office of the Priest still administered to the Faithful for their Participation.*

Century

Ratherii.

Sec. X. Ratherius Episcopus Veronensis Part. 1. de contemptu Canonum, Tom. 2. Spicilegii Veterum Patrum a Dacherio editi, precibus & quidem in specie orationi Dominicæ, quæ post recitata verba Christi funditur, consecrandi vim disertè tribuit, dum docet, quod *illâ specialissimè* oratione consecretur oblatio populo porrigenda, ubi Deo dicitur, *Pater Noster, qui es in cælis, &c.*

Tot igitur & tanti sancti Viri docuerunt, Eucharistiam non solis verbis Christi, *Hoc est corpus meum, & hic est sanguis meus, &c.* sed & prece sacerdotis atq; Spiritûs Sancti invocatione

Ratherius.

Century X. Ratherius Bishop of Verona in the first Part of his Piece concerning the Contempt of the Canons, in the second Tome of Dachier's Spicilegium of the ancient Fathers expressly attributes the Force of the Consecration to Prayer, and in particular to the Lord's Prayer, which is recited after the Words of Christ; for he teaches that the Oblation which is to be given to the People, is, *most properly*, consecrated by that Prayer, in which God is thus addressed, *Our Father which art in Heaven, &c.*

Thus great is the Number, Character, and Holiness of those, who have taught, that the Eucharist is not consecrated by the mere Words of Christ, *This is my Body, and this is my Blood, &c.* but also by



vocatione consecrari; quorum quidem ( utor verbis Theodoret Dial. 3. qui impassibilis dicitur) nonnulli admirandæ illius Societatis participes fuerunt, (subintellige Apostolicæ, uti Jacobus, Marcus, Clemens, quorum Liturgias adduxi,) alii verò post hos in Ecclesiis præclare sese gesserunt, Alii jam inde a priscis temporibus orbem terrarum illustrarunt. At neq; temporum diversitas, neq; linguarum varietas consensui eorum obstitit, sed similes fuerunt lyre, multas quidem & distinctas chordas habenti, unum tamen concinnum & prorsus æquabilem concentum emittenti.

Quum

by the Prayer of the Priest and the invocation of the holy Spirit; some of whom ( to use the Words of Theodoret in his 3d Dialogue called *Impassibilis*) were *Members of that wonderful Society*, ( namely of the Apostles, as James, Mark, and Clement, whose Liturgies I have produced) others after them were famous in the Churches, and others again in succeeding Ages enlightned the World with their Doctrine. But tho' different in Time and Language, they agree in Testimony, and are like a Harp having many and different Strings, but yielding one uniform and harmonious Sound.

When

Quum S. Augustinus Julianum Pelagianum peccatum originale neganti sententias undecim veterum probatorum Patrum diversæ ætatis opposuisset, hominem non minus, aut magis etiam, quàm si in Oecumenicâ Synodo falsa ejus doctrina rejecta fuisset, convictum oppressumq; esse censuit, indeq; sub finem lib. 2. istum Julianum ita alloquitur, *Si Episcopalis synodus ex toto orbe congregaretur, mirum si tales possent illic sedere tot, quia nec isti uno tempore fuerunt. Hos itaq; de aliis atq; aliis temporibus atq; Regionibus, ab Oriente & Occidente congregatos vides, non in locum quo navigare cogantur homines, sed in librum, qui navigare possit ad homines.* Hæc verba jam potiori

- When S. Austin had produced the Testimonies of eleven approved Fathers of different Ages against Julian the Pelagian's denial of Original Sin, he look'd upon the Man as no less, or rather more convicted and condemned, than if his false Doctrine had been sentenc'd by an Oecumenical Synod, and therefore at the End of his second Book he thus addresses himself to him, *If an Episcopal Synod was assembled from all Parts of the World, it would be a Miracle if so many and such as these were there, for they did not all live at one time; Here you have a Synod assembled from different Ages and Regions, from the East and from the West, not in a Place where Men are obliged to pass the Seas to them, but in a Book, which may pass the Seas to Men.* With more Reason might

tiori jure Græcus contra Latinum usurparet; siquidem non modò eosdem ferè omnes, quos S. Augustinus ibi adduxit Patres, sed & alios, quin duplo plures, & longiori ætate diversos, pro suâ contra Latinorum adducere potest sententiam; quos in unum locum, hunc scilicet libellum, congregatos stiti, ut Oecumenici statuti vicem obtineant junctim sumpta istorum dicta. Quinetiam sententiam reapse habiti Concilii Oecumenici Græci pro se allegant, nempe Nicæni II. Oecumenici VII. in quo Epiphanius Diaconus Tom. III. Actione VI. nomine totius Concilii disputans contra Iconomachos panem & vinum corporis & sanguinis Christi imagines sive signa esse

might the Greeks make the same Objection to the Latins; for they can produce, not only almost all the same Fathers, which S. Austin alledges, but others also, nay double the Number; and those more distant in Time from one another, for their Opinion against the Latins; which I have here assembled in one Place, namely in this Book, that their Testimonies being taken together, may have the Force of an Oecumenical Decree. Besides the Greeks alledge for themselves, the Testimony of a real Oecumenical Synod, which is the second Nicene, and seventh general Council, in which Epiphanius the Deacon, Tom. III. Action the VI. disputing in the Name of the whole Council against the Image-Breakers, who held, that the Bread and Wine were the Images, or Signs of the Body and Blood of Christ, acknowledges that the Bread and Wine are, in the holy Father



esse statuentes, concedit quidem in S. Patris Basilii Liturgiâ panem atq; vinum dici ἀντίτυπα corporis & sanguinis Dominici, aque ita ab ipso appellari ante consecrationem. *Alter*, inquit Epiphanius de Basilio. Tom. V. Concil, p. 758. *In oratione divinæ Oblationis ita dicit; confidentes appropinquamus Sancto altari, & proponentes antitypa sancti corporis & sanguinis Christi tui, te deprecamur, & te rogamus, & quod deinceps infertur, certiore Patris hujus designat intellectum, qualiter antequam sanctificata fuerint, vocata sunt antitypa, post sanctificationem autem corpus propriè ac sanguis Christi dicuntur scilicet, & creduntur. Atqui verba allegata, inq; iis usurpata vox ἀντίτυπων in Basilii Liturgiâ sequuntur verba Christi, Hoc est corpus meum, Hic est sanguis meus, præcedunt autem preces sacerdotis, qui-*

Basil's Liturgy, called the Antitypes of the Body and Blood of the Lord, but contends that they are so called by him before Consecration. *The one*, says Epiphanius, speaking of Basil, Tom. V. Concil. p. 758. *in the Prayer of divine Oblation, says thus, We approach with Boldness to thy holy Altar, and laying before thee the Antitypes of the holy Body and Blood of thy Christ, pray and beseech thee. Which with what follows, plainly shews the Meaning of the Father to be this, That they are called Antitypes before Consecration, but are both properly called and believed to be the Body and Blood of Christ afterwards. But the Passage alledged, and the Word ἀντίτυπων used in that Passage in Basil's Liturgy follows the Words of Christ, This is my Body, This is my Blood, and is itself followed by the Prayers of the Priest,*

quibus Deum rogat, ut demittat Spiritum Sanctum, qui faciat panem corpus, & vinum sanguinem Christi; unde ineluctabile ducitur argumentum, Epiphanium cum Synodo Nicænâ haud in eâ fuisse opinione, consecrationem istis Christi verbis absolvi, sed credidisse, accedente postea dictâ invocatione Spiritûs Sancti, sacra symbola transmutari in corpus & sanguinem Domini. Quod verò Bellarminus adversus hoc argumentum excipit, ex sententiâ Epiphanii usurpatam esse vocem *ἀνέστη* eo loco, ubi Basilii loquitur *de pane, ac si nondum esset consecratus, licet reverâ esset consecratus*, id ita comparatum est, ut meritò huic objectioni opponatur istud Gregorii Nazianzeni Orat. 37. de Sp. San. num. 47. Tom.

I.

in which he beseeches God to send down his Holy Spirit to make the Bread the Body, and the Wine the Blood of Christ. From whence we may draw an unanswerable Argument, that Epiphanius and the Nicene Council were not of Opinion, that the Consecration was finished by these Words of Christ, but believed that by the following Invocation of the Holy Spirit, the sacred Symbols were changed into the Body and Blood of the Lord. And as to Bellarmine's Exception to this Argument, that according to Epiphanius's Opinion, the Word *Antitypes* was used in that Place, where Basil speaks of the Bread as *not yet consecrated, tho' it really was consecrated*; it is such a Reason as deserves no other Answer, but that of Gregory Nazianzen. Orat. 37. concerning the Holy Spirit, num. 47. Tom. 1. p. 603. C. *This is to prescribe Laws to Words*

1. p. 603 C. τοῦτο νομοθετοῦνός ἐστι τοῖς ὀνόμασιν, οὐκ ἀληθεύοντι. *Hoc jam est ejus qui legem vocibus* (earumq; significationi) *prescribit, non verum profitentis.* Vis intertur tam Basilii quam Epiphanii verbis: haud enim est verosimile, Basilium in Liturgiâ de pane revera consecrato, ac in corpus Domini mutato ita locutum esse, quasi non esset consecratus ac corpus Domini factus, dum sit figura corporis Dominici. Istud autem manifestè falsum est, Epiphanium contra Iconomachos disputantem in hunc sensum verba Basilii accepisse. Nam tota vis responsionis Epiphanii consistit in distinctione inter panem & vinum *consecrandum* & *consecratum*, atq; de illis a Basilio dictum affirmat, quod sint ἀντίτυπα corporis & sanguinis Domini; de his verò, nempe conse-

(and their Signification) *not to regard the Truth.* Both Basil and Epiphanius's Words are forced: for it is not likely, that Basil in his Liturgy would speak in such a manner of the Bread, that was really consecrated, and changed into the Lord's Body, as if being a Figure of his Body, it had not been consecrated and made such. But it is manifestly false, that Epiphanius disputing against the Image-Breakers, took Basil's Words in this Sense: For the whole Force of Epiphanius's Answer consists in the Distinction between Bread and Wine to be consecrated, and the same already consecrated; and he affirms, that Basil speaking of the former, calls them the Antitypes of the Body and Blood of the Lord; but he expressly denies, that the same



secratis, id prædicari disertè negat, siquidem sint ipsum corpus & sanguis Christi. Quâ ratione autem Epiphanius negare potuisset, panem consecratum & vinum a Basilio dicta esse *ἀντίτυπα* corporis & sanguinis Christi, si rem ita se revera habere credidisset, & putasset S. Basilium vocem hanc de pane & vino jam revera consecratis, uti Bellarminus autumat, usurpasse? Manet igitur ratum firmumq; Epiphanium & cum eo alios Concilii Oecumenici VII. Patres, quorum nomine loquebatur, dum dicit S. Basilium vocem *ἀντίτυπα*, quæ verba Christi sequitur & precationem sacerdotis supra memoratam præcedit, de pane & vino usurpasse, antequam consecrata sint, eo ipso aperte docuisse, verbis Christi consecrationem non ab-

same Term can be applied to the others, which are already consecrated, because they are the very Body and Blood of Christ. But how could Epiphanius deny, that the consecrated Bread and Wine were by Basil called the Antitype of Christ's Body and Blood, if he had really believed the contrary, and had thought S. Basil used this Term, as Bellarmine imagines, of the Bread and Wine, which were already consecrated? It is certain therefore, that Epiphanius, and the other Fathers of the 7th General Council, in whose Name he spoke, did plainly teach, that the Consecration is not finished by the Words of Christ, but also by the Prayers of the Priest, when he declared, that S. Basil used the Term *Antitypes* of the unconsecrated Bread and Wine, which Term follows the Words

absolvi, sed precibus sacerdotis simul eam perfici. Quod insuper ex Damasceno patet, qui lib. 4. de orthodoxâ fide, cap. 14. ubi eâdem, quâ Epiphanius, responsione petitam ex Basilio objectionem repellit; expresse quoq; eodem loco verbis paulo præcedentibus docet, panem & vinum *διὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος* per invocationem Sp. Sancti transmutari in corpus & sanguinem Domini, quod est, plenissimè consecrari. Neq; consensum S. Patrum hæcenus allegatorum infringunt quædam contraria S. Patrum dicta, a Bellarmino aliisq; allata, ad quæ responderi, paucis mutatis, potest ex Albertino, l. 1. de Sacramento Eucharistiæ, cap. 7. & Dallæo lib. 3. de cultibus Latinorum cap. 16. Præcipuum, quod pro La-  
ti-

Words of Christ, and comes before the above-mentioned Prayer of the Priest; which also may be further proved from Damascen, who in his 4th Book concerning the Orthodox Faith, chap. 14. where he gives the same Answer with Epiphanius to the Objection from Basil, does also in the same place, a few Words before, expressly teach, that the Bread and Wine *are changed into the Body and Blood of the Lord, by the Invocation of the Holy Ghost*, which is to be fully consecrated. Nor is the consentient Testimony of the Fathers alledged at all weakned by some contrary Sayings, produced from them by Bellarmine and others, to which we may, with a few Alterations, answer from Albertinus in his first Book of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, chap. 7. and from Dallee in his third Book of the  
Wor-

tinorum sententiâ facit, est petatum ex S. Ambrosii lib. 4. de sacramentis. cap. 4, & 5. Verum libros hosce haud verè esse S. Ambrosii aliquot argumentis probavit Albertinus. lib. 2. de Eucharistiâ, p. 507. Quæ & fecerunt, ut ex ipsis Romano-Catholicis, post Arnaldum, vehementer de iis dubitaverit Bona, lib. 1. Rerum Liturgicarum, cap. 7. ff. 4. Ex dubiis igitur, aut suppositis Ambrosii libris nihil probari potest; præsertim cum alio loco supra à nobis citato verus Ambrosius disertis verbis asserat, *panem & vinum per sacræ orationis mysterium in carnem & sanguinem Domini transfigurari*. Reliqua discursui reservantur, tam quæ ad Ambrosii, quàm quæ ad reliquorum Patrum dicta regeri possunt. Conferantur

Worship of the Latins, cap. 16. The chief Argument for the Romish Opinion is taken from S. Ambrose's 4th Book of the Sacraments, chap. 4 and 5: But Albertinus has offer'd some Reasons to prove, that S. Ambrose was not the Author of these Books, in his 2d Book of the Eucharist, p. 507. which had Strength enough to make Arnaldus and Bona among the Roman-Catholicks themselves, doubt of them. Liturgic. Discourses, Book 1. chap. 7. ff. 4. There can then be no Proof drawn from the doubtful or supposititious Books of Ambrose, especially since the genuine Ambrose does in another Place, before-cited by us, assert in exprefs Words, that *Bread and Wine are transfigured into the Body and Blood of the Lord by the Mystery of holy Prayer*. The other Objection, as well in Relation to S. Ambrose, as to the Sayings



tur Authores citati, & ex ipsis Romano-Catholicis Ambrosius Catharinus & Christophorus de Capite fontium, primo Generalis Ordinis Minorum Minister, deinde Archiepiscopus Cæsariensis, in Tractatibus quos contra Latinorum sententiam ediderunt, scilicet, in Indicem Librorum prohibitorum idcirco relatis. Atque ista hâc vice sufficiant.

ings of the other Fathers, remain to be discuss'd. Compare the Authors above cited, and of the Roman-Catholicks, Ambrosius Catharinus, and Christophorus de Capite-fontium, first, General of the Order of the Friars Minors, and afterwards Archbishop of Cæsarea, in the Treatises which they published against the Opinion of the Latins, and which upon that Account were prohibited in the Index Expurgatorius. And let thus much suffice for this Time.



*Of the Oblation of the Body and  
Blood of Christ, and Representa-  
tion of what is done in Heaven.*

NUM. 167.

**T**HAT Action, which in the Celebration of the holy Eucharist, hath ever been perform'd in all Christian Churches throughout the whole World by Orthodox Priests, even in the Times of the holy Apostles, as well as by Hereticks, which kept up that holy Ordinance; and hath been observ'd under that Notion, that our Saviour did it himself in the first Institution of the blessed Sacrament; that Action, I say, is doubtless of Apostolical Tradition, and instituted by Christ, although it not in plain Terms is recorded by the holy Evangelists, and ought therefore still devoutly to be observed in the Celebration of that holy Mystery.

Now the Oblation of Bread and Wine to God the Father, partly to agnize him as the Creator and supreme Lord of all the World, partly to commemorate and represent before him the Oblation of Christ's Body and Blood on the Cross, to the Intent that he might be propitious to them that offer'd, and for whom it was offer'd, and make them Partakers of all the Benefits of Christ's Passion: Such Action, I say, hath in all Christian Churches throughout the World, ever  
L been

been performed by Catholick Priests, even in the Apostles Time, as also by the Heretics that had any Eucharist; and hath been observed under that Notion, that Christ did it himself, in the first Institution of that holy Sacrament.

Therefore such an Oblation is of Apostolical Tradition, and instituted by Christ, although it not in plain Terms is recorded by the holy Evangelists; and ought therefore still devoutly to be observed in the Celebration of that holy Mystery.







*Of the Oblation of the Body and  
Blood of Christ; and Representation  
of what is done in Heaven.*

N U M. 167.

**T**HE Form of Consecration, and Opinion of the consecrated Eucharistical Elements, in which both Catholicks and Hereticks in the Age immediately succeeding the holy Apostles, have agreed together, and which ever since has been kept in all ancient Churches, and is by some of the Fathers expressly reckoned amongst the unwritten Apostolical Traditions, and is moreover hinted at in the very Writings of the New Testament, cometh undoubtedly from the holy Apostles, if not from our Lord himself, and ought therefore by no Means to be changed, otherwise it will make the Consecration doubtful, or at least unlawful for them that understand this Matter.

Now in the Form of Consecration of the Eucharistical Bread and Wine, by which God is intreated to bless and sanctify these very Elements by his Divine Grace and Holy Spirit, and in the Doctrine that those consecrated Symbols are sanctified and altered, if not in their Substance, yet in their internal Qualities, so that they have in themselves the Virtue of our Lord's Body and Blood; in this, I say, have Catholicks, as well

as Hereticks agreed in the Age immediately following the holy Apostles ; and both such a Form of Consecration and Doctrine, hath ever been kept in all ancient Churches ; and the former is by S. Basil, lib. de Sp. Sanct. cap. 27. reckoned among the unwritten Apostolical Traditions, yea, the same is hinted at, Rom. xv. 16.

Therefore the said Form of Consecration and Doctrine of the consecrated Elements cometh undoubtedly from the holy Apostles, if not from our Lord himself, and ought therefore by no Means to be changed ; otherwise it will make the Consecration doubtful, or at least unlawful for them that understand this Matter.

The first Proposition in this Argument seems to be undeniable ; since even the Parts of it singly taken by ancient and modern Divines have been used as Proofs of Apostolical Tradition ; For the two last Parts drawn from the Testimony of some Fathers, and the Allusions in the sacred Writings afford a probable Argument : The universal Practice of all Christian Churches maketh it more sure, especially if the Matter by no universal Council hath been determined or enjoined. Whence S. Austin lib. 14. de Baptismo contra Donatistas, cap. 24. layeth down this following Proposition ; *Quod universa tenet Ecclesia, nec conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi auctoritate Apostolicâ Traditum rectissime \* creditur.* But the Con-

\* That is, Whatsoever is held by the Universal Church, and always observed without being settled by any conciliary Decree, is rightly believed an Apostolical Tradition.

sent of Catholicks and Hereticks in the Age next to the holy Apostles is a plain Demonstration; because neither the Latter were willing to receive Doctrines and Forms of Prayer from the Former, much less the Former from the Latter; and therefore their Consent must be founded upon an antecedent Authority, which they both did acknowledge, I mean that of the holy Apostles, or of our Lord himself: But if all these forementioned Topicks concur together in the same Doctrine or Practice, it is still more, and the same is of an irresistible Force, like to the Proof of the Authority of the Four Gospels and other Apostolical writings, which standeth upon the same Foundation, and hath, as for the ancient Histories, not such a Consent of them; for the Ebionites received only S. Matthew's Gospel; the Corinthians, or rather the Marcossii, S. Mark's; the Marcionites, S. Luke's; the Valentinians, S. John's; as Irenæus tells us lib. 3. cap. 2. not to mention others. Whereas I can shew the Consent of the three Latter in Proof of my minor Proposition, about the fore-mentioned Form of Consecration and Doctrine of the consecrated Elements, to which I now proceed.

We have three Forms of the Eucharistical Liturgy used in the three first Centuries, 1. That in the 8th Book of Clement's Constitutions, which I take to be the earliest Form of the Church of Jerusalem, next to the Apostolical Age, very little interpolated. 2. That of the Church of Jerusalem in the 2d. 3d. and 4th. Centuries, which runneth under the Name of S. James. And 3dly. That of the Church of Alexandria, which beareth the Name of S. Mark. In S. James's Liturgy the form of Consecration is, Tom. XII. Biblioth. Patr. Paris, 1644. p. 254. Seq. *Miserere nostri*



*nostri Deus, secundum magnam misericordiam tuam, & demitte super nos & super hæc dona proposita Spiritum tuum Sanctissimum, ut superveniens sancta & bona & gloriosa sua presentia sanctificet & efficiat (ἀγιασθήτω τοῖς ἁγίοις) hunc panem corpus sanctum Christi tui & calicem hunc pretiosum sanguinem Christi \* tui, which Words certainly had in his Thoughts Ephrem Syrus, Orat. de sacerdotio, Tom. i. p. 20. col. 1. where he of the Priest saith, Misericordiam & indulgentiam a Rege misericorde postulans, ut Spiritus Sanctus pariter descendat sanctificetq; dona in terris † proposita, (panem & vinum in altari propositum.) And Cyril Bishop of Jerusalem, Catech. V. Mystag. p. 241. B. Deum benignissimum oramus, ut super illa proposita S. Spiritum emitat, ut panem quidem faciat Corpus Christi, vinum vero sanguinem † Christi. Likewise in S. Mark's Liturgy, Tom. XII. Bibl. M. Patr. p. 278. the Priest prayeth thus, Emitte super nos & super panes istos & calices istos Spiritum Sanctum tuum, ut eos sanctificet & consecret, tanquam Deus Omnipotens, & faciat panem quidem corpus, calicem autem sanguinem novi Testamenti ipsius Domini & Dei & Servatoris & summi regis nostri Jesu †† Christi, with which Words very much agree those of Optatus Milevitanus lib. 6. contra Parmenianum Donatistam, where, he making Mention of the Altars, saith, Quò Deus Omnipotens invocatus sit, quò postulatus descendit Spiritus \*\* Sanctus. So that it seemeth the Africans had taken*

\* See this translated pag. 10.

† See this translated pag. 45.

‡ See this translated pag. 44.

†† See This translated pag. 11.

\*\* See this translated pag. 49.

the said Eucharistical Formal from their Neighbours the Ægyptians. Lastly, S. Clement's Liturgy lib. 8. Constit. cap. 12. runneth thus ; *Regamus te, ut benignè adspicere digneris super hæc dona propofita in conspectu tuo, — & mittas S. Spiritum tuum super hoc sacrificium, testem passionum Domini Jesu, ut efficiat hunc panem corpus Christi tui, & hunc calicem sanguinem Christi \* tui.* I know very well, that in S. James's, S. Mark's, and perhaps in S. Clement's Liturgy too, some Words and Phrases are foisted in ; but those Expressions wherein they all agree, as in that Formal of lifting up the Hearts, and praising God with the angelical Hymn, *Sanctus, sanctus, &c.* as also in this that God would send down his Holy Spirit, and sanctify the Elements of Bread and Wine to be the Body and Blood of Christ, these cannot be imagined to be added in latter Ages, unless we could suppose, that one Hand or Authority did it every-where ; since not only those, but twenty and more other Liturgies of latter Ages, in different Nations and Tongues, have all the said Form, which likewise is mentioned by so many ancient Fathers of the Catholick Church. But to prove clearer the Apostolical Antiquity of this Form of Consecration, and that thereupon dependant before-mentioned Opinion of the Change in the consecrated Elements ; I will cite three Catholick and three Heretical Witnesses of the first three Ages after Christ. I begin with that old Heretick Marcus the Magician, of whom Irenæus lib 1. cap. 1. writeth thus ; *ποθήρα πάντα κενεαμένα ποσποισ-*

\* See this translated pag. 12.

μεν<sup>Θ</sup> εὐχαρισεῖν, καὶ ἐπὶ πλέον ἐκείνων τὸν λόγον  
 τῆς ἐπικλήσεως, πορφύρεα καὶ ἐρυθρὰ ἀναφαίνεσθαι  
 ποιεῖ. ὡς δοκεῖν τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπὲρ τὰ ὅλα χάριν τὸ  
 αἷμα τὸ ἐαυτῆς σάξαι ἐν τῇ ἐκείνῳ \* ποιηεῖν. From  
 which Words it is plain, that this Heretick did  
 consecrate his Eucharistical Elements by a Prayer,  
 in which he desired that God would by his Power  
 bless or sanctify the Eucharistical Elements, and  
 change them not only in their Qualities, but in  
 their Substance too, as it seemeth. But plainer  
 are the Words of that other old Heretick Theo-  
 dotus, of which Clemens Alexandrinus hath saved  
 us some Excerpta, amongst whom pag. 800. col.  
 2. we read these Words; καὶ ὁ ἄρ<sup>Θ</sup>, καὶ τὸ ἑλαιον  
 ἀγιαζεῖται τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ ὀνόματος (lege cum Alber-  
 tino lib. 2. de Euchristiā pag. 320. col. 2. πνεύμα-  
 τ<sup>Θ</sup>) καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ ὄντα κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον, οἷα ἐλήφθην,  
 ἀλλὰ δυνάμει εἰς δυνάμιν πνευματικὴν † μεταβέβλη-  
 ται. And since I have mentioned these two Here-  
 ticks before the Catholick Fathers, because I take  
 them to be more ancient than any of those, which  
 are by and by to be quoted in this Matter, I add  
 here likewise the third, represented by Origen,  
 or who the Author is, of the Dialogue with the  
 Marcionite; where the Heretick, fl. 2. pag. 53.

\* That is, Pretending to consecrate the Cup mixed with  
 Wine, and extending the Prayer of Invocation to a great  
 Length, he makes the Cup appear of a purple and red Co-  
 lour, that the Grace which is from above may seem to shed  
 his own Blood in that Cup.

† That is, Both the Bread and the Oyl are sanctified by  
 the Power of the Name, (read the Spirit instead of the  
 Name according to Albertinus, Book 2. concerning the Eu-  
 charist, pag. 320. col. 2.) and are not what they appear to  
 be, when they are taken, but are virtually changed into a  
 spiritual Power.



faith of the Holy Spirit, ἐπὶ τῆς εὐχαριστίας \* ἐρχε-  
ται. Upon which Words Wetstenius justly remark-  
eth, that they are spoken in Relation to the before-  
said Form of Consecration and Doctrine of the  
consecrated Elements.

But Origen out of his own Mind writeth, lib.  
8. against Celsus, pag. 399. thus : *Nos qui rerum  
omnium Conditori placere studemus, cum precibus & gra-  
tiarum Actione pro beneficiis acceptis edimus oblatos pa-  
nes per Precationem factos sanctum quoddam corpus* Σῶ-  
μα γενομένης διὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἁγίον † τι. Where he  
supposeth that the Consecration is done by Prayer,  
and the Bread sanctified, namely, by the H. Ghost's  
descending from Heaven. And this is even *res cæle-  
stis*, of which Irenæus the second Witness, somewhat  
elder, speaketh, lib. 4. cap. 34. Ἄρτος προσλαμβε-  
νόμενος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν (ἐπίκλησιν) τῷ θεῷ, ἐκείνῳ κοινὸς  
ἄρτος ἐστίν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία, ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συν-  
εσηκυσία, ἐπιγίγνεται \*\* ἑρμηνεία, as I have shewn in  
the Annotation to that Place. For Confirmation  
of which, I now add the Words of Irenæus, lib. 5.  
cap. 9. where treating of another Matter, he saith,  
*Quid est terrenum ? Plasma : quid autem cæleste ? †† Spi-  
ritus.* Now, that this heavenly Spirit is join'd to  
the Bread, Irenæus ascribeth to the ἐπίκλησις \* θεοῦ,  
relating to the fore-mentioned Prayer, for Descent  
of the Holy Ghost, which likewise Cyril of Jeru-  
salem, Catech. M. pag. 235. calleth ἐπίκλησιν τῷ

\* That is, it descends upon the Eucharist.

† See this translated, p. 42.

\*\* That is, when the Bread receives the Invocation of God,  
it is no longer common Bread, but the Eucharist, consisting  
of two Things, the one earthly, the other heavenly.

†† What is the earthly Thing ? The Creature. And  
what is the Heavenly ? The Spirit.

\* That is, the Invocation of God.

αἷμα \* πνεύματι, not to mention other Fathers. And hence, saith Irenæus, in the same 34th chap. of the 4th Book, *Offerimus ei non quasi indigenti, sed gratias agentes dominationi ejus, & sanctificantes † creaturam*. Concerning lastly Justin Martyr, his Words to this Purpose are these, Apol. 1. near the End, fl. 86. in the late Edition. ὃν τρέπον διὰ λόγον θεῶν σαρκοποιήσας ἰησὺς χριστὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, καὶ σὰρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχεν, ἕτως καὶ τὴν διευχῆς λόγον τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστήσαν τρέφον ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μελαβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνῳ τῷ σαρκοποιήσαντι ἰησὺ καὶ σὰρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδόχαμεν †† εἶναι. Where he the Consecration plainly ascribeth to a Prayer, and that even us'd or perscrib'd by Christ, and therefore hath understood either the Lord's Prayer, *Our Father*, &c. of which Hierom. lib. 3. adversus Pelagianos, saith, *Docuit Christus Apostolos suos, ut quotidie in Corporis illius Sacrificio credentes audeant loqui, Pater \*\* noster, &c.* And with which all, or almost all the Christian Churches have ended the Prayers in the Consecration of the H. Eucharist, as S. Austin observeth, Epist. 59. ad Paulinum, or he hath spoken of the before-mention'd

\* *That is*, the Invocation of the holy Spirit.

† *That is*, we make our oblations to him, not as if he needed them, but as an Act of Homage and Thanksgiving, and for the Sanctification of the Creature.

†† *That is*, as our Saviour Jesus Christ, being incarnated by the Word of God, had Flesh and Blood for the Sake of our Salvation; so we have been taught, that the Food which is consecrated by the power of his Word, and nourishes our Flesh and Blood by being incorporated with it, is the Flesh and Blood of that incarnate Jesus.

\*\* *That is*, Christ taught his Apostles to say boldly, and with Faith, in the daily Sacrifice of his Body, *Our Father, &c.*

**Formul.** For it is not to be imagined, that if any other Prayer of Consecration by our Saviour in the first Institution of the H. Eucharist had been us'd or prescrib'd, the very first Christians, both Catholicks and Hereticks, had left that and taken up another. And as for the Opinion, that the consecrated Elements are sanctified, and have in them all the divine Grace and Virtue of our Lord's Body and Blood; this is the least Sense, that can be put upon the quoted Words of Justin Martyr. Whence the R. Reverend Bishop of Salisbury, in the Exposition of the 28th Article of the Church of *England*, pag. 334 saith, *It is not to be denied, but that very early, both Justin Martyr and Irenaeus thought, that there was such a Sanctification of the Elements, that there was a divine Virtue in them.*

I think, I have made good the first Part of my Minor Proposition.

## II.

As the Matter and Form are inward and essential Parts of a Thing, and the outward Perfection of it is the right Use to the End for which it was at first design'd; so is, by a Fault in, or total Absence of either of the former, a Thing essentially maim'd, or is not at all really what it is called, and by the Defect in, or Want of the latter, the Thing is made outwardly imperfect, and loses its proper Effect and Esteem. And as this is true in every Thing, so it must needs be in the Eucharist; in which, if the Matter or Form, by which the same is made a Sacrament, be totally wanting, or faulty and defective, it is either no Sacrament at all, or it is very doubtful, that it is



such ; and if the Sacrament truly and really is not directed to the End, for which it was at first instituted and designed, it loseth its outward Perfection, and becometh less pleasing to God, and less beneficial to Men. It is therefore an indispensable Duty, incumbent upon every Christian Church, and every Priest in it, strictly to keep to the same Matter and Form, which our Lord Jesus Christ, and his holy Apostles, have used in the first Institution and Celebration of this sacred Mystery, and to do in and with it what these have done ; lest if they diminish or take ought off it, they should lose either the Substance or the Benefit of this most holy Sacrament ; and consequently, if through Ignorance or Mistake, a Fault or Defect hath happen'd any where in these Things, it is the bounden Duty of the Bishops and Priests of that Church to rectify the same, the receiv'd Customs, and human Laws notwithstanding ; and of every one, who by reading the H. Scriptures and Writings of the ancient Apostolical Fathers, is come to the Knowledge of such Fault or Defect, to put 'em in Mind of it, and to shew the same, in order that it may be amended, since every one, *who knoweth the Truth, and doth not declare it, shall be judged by the Lord on the Last Day*, as Justin Martyr remarkably speaketh to Trypho in Dialog.





II.

*Some imperfect Notes concerning the  
Matter and Form of the Holy  
Eucharist.*

N U M B. 169.

*Of the Form by which the H. Eucharist is  
consecrated.*

**C**ONCERNING this Form, I lay down three Pro-  
positions, before I come to the Application,  
and propose my Thoughts concerning the Defect  
in the Prayer of Consecration, according to the  
Rubrick of the Church of England.

*Prop. I.* To the due Consecration of the Bread  
and Wine mixt with Water, as the Matter of this  
Sacrament, is required a determin'd special Form  
of Words, or Prayer, or both. I say, a special  
Form, and a determin'd one, if not in Sound,  
yet in Sense, perfect. For I do not think that a  
vague general Mention of Christ's Sufferings, and a  
Thanksgiving to God for them, with Prayer to  
make us Partakers of the Benefits of the same, will  
consecrate the Bread and Wine into Christ's Body  
and Blood, or make them a Sacrament of the same :  
At least I do not see, how any one can be so  
sure, as we ought to be in this Matter, that  
such a Thanksgiving and Prayer is valid and  
sufficient to the said Consecration, and therefore

I

I assert and say with S. Austin, *Panis noster CERTA CONSECRATIONE fit mysticus ; quod si non ita fiat, non est Sacramentum religionis, sed alimentum \* refectiois.*

1. If the Form, by which the Eucharistical Bread and Wine are made the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, were only the Words of our Saviour *This is my Body, This is my Blood*, rehearsed and pronounced over them by the Priest, as the Church of Rome, and some of the Protestants, especially the Lutherans, do teach; then no Objection could be made against the Form of Consecration of the H. Eucharist in the Church of England, since she expressly Commandeth and directeth in the Rubrick, that no Bread and Wine should be given to the Communicants as Sacramental, but over which the aforesaid Words have been pronounced by the Priest. But I have prov'd shortly, in a Note upon Irenæus, lib. 5. cap. 2. pag. and more larger in the Paper A. that the Consecration of the Eucharistical Symbols is perform'd, not, or not only, by the Rehearsal of the aforesaid Words of Christ, but chiefly, if not only, by the Prayer of the Priest or Minister, as the Greek Church and some of the Protestants, especially those, who are called Calvinists, (tho' they wisely refuse this Denomination) do assert.

2. If the Eucharistical Bread and Wine by the Consecration are not at all alter'd or chang'd in themselves, but are only made to our Apprehension and Use the Representatives and Symbols of

\* That is, Our Bread is made mystical by a special Consecration, and without that it is not a religious Sacrament, but a Meal of Refreshment.

Christ's



Christ's Body and Blood, at the taking of which the Souls of the Worthy Communicants only spiritually eat the Flesh, and drink by Faith the Blood of Christ, or are made Partakers of the Benefits of his Passion, and of his Spirit, with which his human Nature was anointed, as the aforesaid Calvinists do teach, no reasonable Man could have any Scruple against the Form or Prayer of the Eucharistical Consecration in the Church of England, as being perfectly agreeable to, and even fram'd according to this Notion, which is also fully express'd in the 27th Article, which runneth thus; *The Body of Christ, &c. still is Faith* But I am perswaded, I have proved in my Note upon Irenæus. lib. 3. cap. 2. p: and more largely in the Paper B. even by the Testimony of some Calvinists or Protestants, and of my Lord Bishop of Salisbury, that the Primitive Fathers next to the Apostles Age, and much more downwards, did believe, that the consecrated Bread and Wine were chang'd, if not in their Substance, yet in their inward Qualities; and that they not only represented and exhibited to the Faith of the Communicants the Body and Blood of Christ expired and pour'd out on the Cross; but that the Eucharistical Symbols themselves were verily made in a mysterious Manner the Body and Blood of our crucified Saviour, and that this sacramental Flesh and Blood of Christ was taken by a corporeal Eating and Drinking of the Unworthy, as well as Worthy Communicants; of these, namely, to their Justification and eternal Salvation, both of Flesh and Spirit; but of those to their Condemnation and everlasting Destruction of Soul and Body. And this Consecration or Sanctification of the Bread and Wine they believed was wrought by the Power of Almighty God and his Holy Spirit, who being invited and called down  
by

by the Prayer of the Priest, descended upon the Bread and Wine on the Altar, and enriched 'em with all the Virtues and Graces, with which the personal Body and Blood of Christ did abound, and so made them in this, and perhaps, in a yet more mysterious and incomprehensible Manner, to be verily the Body and Blood of Christ; as the Holy Ghost did formerly come upon the blessed Virgin, and formed in her Womb the personal Body and Blood of Christ.

Now, if this Belief of the Primitive Christians, (who living near the Age of Christ and his holy Apostles, could best know, what was the true Meaning and full Intent of the Words of Christ, *This is my Body, This is my Blood*, which in themselves are ambiguous, and bear several Senses) be true, and if 1500 Years after, the Form of Prayer for the said Sanctification and sacramental Change of the Eucharistical Bread and Wine by the Power and Spirit of God, hath been changed upon the Disbelief of this mysterious Doctrine, not by Chance or bare Ignorance; and if now, both the Priest Officiating, and the People communicating, do likewise disbelieve the same, or have no Notion of it at all, and consequently do neither desire in their Hearts, nor pray with their Mouths to God for such a Sanctification of the Bread and Wine by the Holy Ghost; yea, if they ask no Blessing at all upon the Bread and Wine, but only for themselves, namely, that they receiving outwardly those Elements, may at the same time inwardly by Faith receive the Body and Blood of Christ, or the Benefits of his Sufferings; in this Case, I say, it may reasonably be doubted, if not denied, that God doth bless and sanctify by his Holy Spirit the Bread and Wine, and make them the Body and Blood of Christ.



## III.

*Two Fragments of a designed Preface to a new Edition of Edward the Vith's First Liturgy.*

N U M B. 174.

FROM all Testimonies and Monuments, 'tis plain, that all Tongues and Nations in all Ages of the Christian Church have called, and almost all still do call to God, for his blessed Spirit to bless and sanctify the Eucharistical Symbols of Bread and Wine. And as I do not question, that the self same Holy Spirit hath directed them thereunto by his Apostles (to whom he gave from the Beginning, the Utterance of the Sacred Mysteries in all Languages) and taught them how to Pray in the Celebration of the most Holy Sacrament; so I doubt very much (not to be positive and rash in Judgment) if a good Spirit hath abolished this solemn Prayer and Invocation of God for the Sanctification of the Eucharistical Elements; by which Omission the Consecration is made, if not void and null, yet uncertain and doubtful, and much to be fear'd, that the Eucharistical Symbols, and the receiver of them may be, if not quite at all, yet in a great Measure deprived of the Influence of that Blessed Spirit and his wonderful Operation in them.



## E X C E P T.

As for the general Intention and Design of the Priest and People, I believe that it is agreed, that thereby no Sacrament is consecrated, or at least, that no Body can be sure of the Validity of the Consecration, unless both the Matter and Form is used. And therefore, if the Form in the Prayer of Consecration of the holy Eucharist is wrong and defective, the consecration is void, and the general Intention and Design of the Priest and Communicants to be Partakers of Christ's Body and Blood in such a Manner as he designed it, will not make them to be so, and give them a firm Assurance of being by the first Institution thus verily made Partakers of Christ's Body and Blood.

2dly. I do not deny, that the Blessing or Sanctification of Bread and Wine may be applied or implicitly understood in the present Prayer of Consecration, and that God giveth not only those Things, which we ask explicitly, but those also which are implied in the Words of our Prayer. But there are in the present Case three Things to be considered, which will leave the Eucharistical Consecration still doubtful, if not make it void, notwithstanding these Concessions. The First is That the Sanctification of Bread and Wine by the Holy Spirit may be understood or taken in our Mind in the present Form of Prayer, but is not necessarily implied in it at all; for the Faithful may be, and are even by the Church of *England*, supposed to be made Partakers of Christ's Body and Blood spiritually, without such a mystical Change of the Bread and Wine, and consequently the  
Priest

Priest who prayeth the former, doth thereby not pray for the latter.

2dly. Supposing there was a necessary Connexion between these two, and that to the partaking of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament was necessarily required the aforesaid Change in the Elements, as to the Illumination and Sanctification of them is necessarily required the Gift of the Holy Spirit and Benefit of the Word and Sacraments, so that God upon the Prayer for the former, would give the Latter; yet if he that asketh the former, disbelieveth or denieth the latter, and therefore putteth the same, on purpose, out of his Prayer, it may reasonably be questioned, if not denied, that God will give him what he doth not believe, and consequently doth not ask.

For Instance, If a Socinian, or a Quaker, asketh of God Illumination and Sanctification, leaving out on purpose the mentioning of the Holy Ghost, or of the Word and Sacraments, because he doth not believe these at all, or not to be necessary for that Purpose, who can assert that God, notwithstanding this, will give the Holy Spirit and the Benefit of his Word and Sacrament, although they are required for this Illumination and Sanctification? *Fiat Applicatio.*

3 ——— ——— ——— ———

NUM. 178.

By what Words did the Priest consecrate the Symbols of Bread and Wine?

Not so much, or not only by rehearsing the Eucharistical History of the Institution of this holy Sacrament, and pronouncing these Words of our

Saviour, *This is my Body, This is my Blood*, But chiefly by praying to God, that he would send down his Holy Spirit upon the Bread and Wine presented to him on the Altar, and sanctify them so, that they might be the Body and Blood of his Son Jesus Christ.

What did the Primitive Christians believe of the Eucharistical Bread and Wine so consecrated, or how did they receive them?

They believed, that the said Bread and Wine were not only memorial Signs, or Representatives of Christ's Body and Blood, but that they in a mysterious Manner were the same verily and indeed, although not according to the gross Compages, or Substance, yet according to the Spiritual Energy, Valor, Grace, and Virtue of his holy Flesh and Blood communicated to the blessed Elements, by the Power and Operation of the Holy Ghost descending upon them, like as he did upon the blessed Virgin, when the personal Body and Blood of Christ was to be form'd out of her Substance. Whence they revered the holy Sacrament as Divine, and in the nearest Manner joined, or related to Christ, but worshipped it not as God and Christ himself; or if they worshipped Christ in the Sacrament, they ador'd him as present there in a peculiar Manner, by his Grace and Divine Spirit, (like the Jews of old, worshipping him by a visible Sign appearing upon the Ark) not in his whole Person and human Body, which they believed to be in Heaven, whither they lift up their Hearts, speaking and praying to him and his Father, as they are in Heaven above, dwelling visibly in Majesty and Glory, not as they are condescending to us here on Earth, by visible Signs of Favour and Communion of Grace.





BOOKS lately Printed for, and  
Sold by Richard King, at the  
Prince's Arms in St. Paul's Church  
Yard.

**S**picilegium SS. Patrum, ut & Hæreticorum; se-  
culi post Christum natum I. II. & III. Quo-  
rum vel integra monumenta, vel Fragmenta, partim  
ex aliorum Patrum libris jam impressis collegit,  
& cum Codicibus Manuscriptis contulit, partim ex  
MSS. primum edidit; ac singula tam Præfatione,  
quàm Notis Subjunctis Illustravit,

*Joannes Ernestus Græbuis.* In two Volumes.  
Price 9 s

Epicteti Enchiridion Latinis Versibus Adumbra-  
tum. Per *Edwardum Ivis*, A. M. Ædis Christi A-  
lumn. & Rev. Dom. Episc. *Bristol*, a sacris do-  
mesticis. price 2s. 6d.

*Dr. Brett's* Discourse concerning the Necessity  
of discerning the Lord's Body in the Holy Com-  
munion. With a Preface, giving an Account of  
the Erroneous Opinions of the *Papists*, *Lutherans*,  
and *Calvinists*, upon this Subject.

*Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the Sup-  
per of the Lord, there is no bare Sign; no untrue Fi-  
gure of a Thing absent.* First Part of the Homily  
concerning the Sacrament. pr. 1 s.

A Collection of the Principal Liturgies used by  
the Christian Church in the Celebration of the ho-  
ly Eucharist, &c. with a Dissertation upon them,  
&c, by *Tho. Brett*. L. L. D. price 6s.

BOOKS Printed for Richard King, at

A farther Proof of the Necessity of Tradition to explain and interpret the holy Scriptures, &c. By *Tho. Brett*. L. L. D. price 2s.

The Reasonableness and Necessity of some practices of the Reformation of the Church of England, &c. By the Author of the *Necessity of an Alteration*, &c. price 1s. 6d.

Vino Eucharistico aqua necessario admiscenda. Auctore *Thoma Wagstaffe*. P. A. Published in September, 1719. In Answer to Mr. Drake's *Vino Eucharistico Aqua non necessario admiscenda*. price 1s. 6d.

The Doctrine of the Church of Rome concerning Purgatory, proved to be contrary to Catholick Tradition, and inconsistent with the necessary Duty of praying for the Dead as practis'd in the ancient Church. By the Reverend Mr. *Thomas Deacon*, *Prove all Things: Hold fast that which is good*, 1 Thess. v. 21. pr. 2s.

The Unreasonableness of Deism, or the Certainty of a Divine Revelation evinc'd from the Dictates of Reason in General, and the Evidence of our holy Christian Faith in particular, with some Reflections on our modern Pretenders to Free-thinking. Also modern Pleas for Anarchy and Rebellion reviewed: Or, a particular Examination of the Senses of *S. Peter* and *S. Paul*, concerning the Measures of Submission to the Civil Power. By *Joseph Smith*.

*Nullos esse Deos, inane cælum*

*Affirmat S E L I U S: probatque, quod se*

*Factum, dum negat hæc, videt beatum. Martial.*

(Price 4s.)

The Trinity in Unity vindicated, and the following Questions answered.

*the Prince's Arms in S. Pauls Church-Yard.*

1. *Which was the highest Exaltation of the Humanity of Jesus Christ, for to be so united to the Supreme God, (or as the Athanasian Creed expresses it, taken into God) as that it, and the Supreme God, which it is united to, do constitute but one individual Person; or, for it to be exalted at the Right Hand of the Supreme God?*

2. *When the Humanity of Jesus Christ was thus united to, or taken unto the Supreme God, must it not be again separated from, or taken out of him, before it could be capable of being exalted at his Right Hand?*

Together, with an Ode upon the Creation, in Imitation of the first Chapter of *Genesis*, &c. By *Richard Roots*, A. M. Rector of *Chilmark* in *Wilts*. price 1 s.

*The last Day.* A Poem in 12 Books. By the late *J. Bulkeley*, Esq; of *Clare-Hall* in *Cambridge*, Author of the *Letters to the Reverend Dr. Clarke* on *Liberty and Necessity*. pr. 4 s. 6 d.

*The Christian's Defence against the Fears of Death*, with Directions how to die well. Written originally in *French*, by *Charles Drellingcourt*, and abridged from the last *French* Edition by *John Spavan*, M. A. With a true Account of *Mrs. Veal's* Apparition to *Mrs. Bargrave*. pr. 1 s. 6 d. in Sheep, and 2 s. in Calf.

*The Church Catechism*, with single Proofs taken from the Words of Scripture only, after a new Method. By the Reverend Mr. *Bunbury*. pr. 2 d. and 12 s. per Hundred.

*Choice Observations upon the Art of Painting*; together with *Vasari's* Lives of the most eminent Painters from *Cimabue* to the Time of *Raphael* and *Michael Angelo*; with an Explanation of the difficult Terms. pr. 6 s. 6 d.

*The Heroick Friendship*, a Tragedy. By the late Mr. *Orway*. pr. 1 s. 6 d.



**BOOKS Printed for Richard King, &c.**

The Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops justified; and the Bishop of *Durham* vindicated: wherein that infamous Fable of the Ordination at the *Nag's-Head* in *Cheapside*, is clearly confuted. By *John Bramhall*, D. D. late Lord Bishop of *Derry*. pr. 1 s. 6 d.

An Help and Exhortation to worthy Communicating, or a Treatise describing the Meaning, worthy Reception, Duty and Benefits, of the holy Sacrament; and answering the Doubts of Conscience, and other Reasons, which most generally detain Men from it, together with suitable Devotion added; By *John Kettlewell*, late Vicar of *Coles-Hill*, in *Warwickshire*. The eight Edition. Price 4 s.

Sermons preached on several Occasions, to a Society of *British* Merchants in Foreign Parts. By *Basil Kennet*. D. D. pr. 5.

The Memoris of Major *Alexander Ramskins*, a *Higbland* Officer, now in Prison at *Avignon*; being an Account of several remarkable Adventures, during about twenty eight Years Service in *Scotland*, *Germany*, *Italy*, *Flanders*, and *Ireland*; exhibiting a very agreeable and Instructive Lesson of human Life, both in a publick and private Capacity, in several pleasant Instances of his Amours, Galantry, Oeconomy, &c. pr. 1 s. 6 d.

